

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1377250

Gift of The Rev. Mr Robert Starkey.



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

W. Adams Mead-
1928.
Starkey

LAW OR WAR

LAW OR WAR

JX
1952
M34
BY

LUCIA AMES MEAD

AUTHOR OF "MILTON'S ENGLAND," "SWORDS
AND PLOUGHSHARES," ETC.



GARDEN CITY, NEW YORK
DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & COMPANY, INC.

1928

COPYRIGHT, 1928, BY
DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & COMPANY, INC.
All rights reserved

To
ROSE DABNEY FORBES
IN HONOR OF HER DEVOTED,
GENEROUS AND UNTIRING
SERVICE FOR THE CAUSE OF
PEACE

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CALIFORNIA

A5362

PREFACE

This volume is prepared for that increasing body of people who have been roused by the tragedy of the World War and its resulting problems to a new sense of international danger and international duty; who realise that something resolute and comprehensive is necessary if talk of the "next war" is to be stopped; and who begin to see that in organisation lies the hope of the nations, as the founders of our federal republic saw that it was the solution for the problem of growing anarchy in our states.

Serious minds refuse to believe that there is any problem which is hopeless and Elihu Root is right when he says that there is no international dispute so grave that it can not be settled peacefully where there is the will to settle it. He is, in the writer's judgment, equally right in his belief that the League of Nations and the World Court have provided the greatest agencies for world peace in the history of civilisation. This means that it is through law and world organisation that war and its evils are to be overcome; and it is the aim of this volume to illustrate and enforce this truth. The last chapter of the volume was originally prepared as an address which was given at the congress of the World Alli-

PREFACE

ance for International Friendship through the Churches in 1925. Portions of two earlier chapters have appeared in previous writings, though they are here revised.

The world's greatest catastrophe came in the Christian nations, and through the policies and actions of their most highly educated men. But this was due to ignorance or disregard of fundamental facts and principles; and continual disregard of these by governments and peoples will involve repeated catastrophe. We already hear wild predictions of another world war in fifteen or twenty years. Whether that suicide of civilisation shall ensue depends on the education and enlightenment of the rising generation, into whose hands the issues will soon pass. The rising generation needs to know far more than the passing generation did of the true principles of human relations, if it is to avoid the fatal and futile blunders which the suffering world now contemplates.

War is not a natural calamity like the tornado or the earthquake, but an evil for which man is responsible and which it is man's duty to remove. By a right and resolute course war between nations may be abolished in a generation, as witchcraft, slavery and yellow fever have been abolished. The framers of our federal Constitution did not wait for any change of human nature, and we do not need to

PREFACE

wait for the conversion of the world to Christianity before educators and statesmen of the influential nations banish the stupid effort to settle questions of justice by explosives.

This work aims to present in untechnical and simple terms the cardinal points which demand primary consideration in this imperative reform. It endeavours to show the crudity and the mischief of prejudices and slogans which warp the public mind, and which still control many men in high places. It suggests the necessary and the next steps toward adequate world organisation, and it seeks to help earnest men and women to realise more seriously that above all nations is humanity, and that nothing human is foreign to us.

L. A. M.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
I. HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT	1
II. EDUCATION AND WORLD PEACE	20
III. PREPAREDNESS	34
IV. SOME NEGLECTED FACTS ABOUT OUR WARS	50
V. INTERDEPENDENCE	66
VI. CREATING THE INTERNATIONAL MIND	88
VII. DANGEROUS FALLACIES ABOUT WAR AND PEACE	111
VIII. THE POINTS OF VIEW OF MILITARISTS AND PEACEMAKERS	134
IX. PATRIOTIC SONGS, SYMBOLS, AND SOCIETIES	154
X. ARBITRATION, HAGUE COURTS AND CONFER- ENCES	172
XI. THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS	192
XII. BEFORE AND AFTER THE WORLD WAR	215
XIII. THE USE OF ARMED FORCE	243
APPENDIX:	
SOME PEACE ORGANISATIONS	257
COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS	259

LAW OR WAR

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

A BRIEF OUTLINE

In 1860 millions of American citizens maintained that slavery was ordained of God, inevitable, a necessity for civilisation. No one of them or of their descendants maintains that view to-day. As the great task of the nineteenth century was to end man-selling, so the task of the twentieth century, said Andrew Carnegie, is to end man-killing, and the sceptics answer as before: "War is inevitable, it is bound up with human nature," or, as a certain military officer writes in one of the magazines: "As the unoccupied reaches of the earth's surface grow smaller, competition between races and nations must inevitably increase in intensity, and war power, which is the ultimate form of competitive capacity, must exercise even greater influence in the future than in the past." Some people are still fooled by this pseudo-economic wisdom; but the period has passed when such dicta have weight except with

visionaries who are blind to the meaning of history and to the new economics of the twentieth century. As, however, there are still many visionaries with facile pens, practical peace-makers must patiently unravel the intellectual tangle in which vague definitions, half truths, guesses at history, and ignorance of the new organic unity of economic interests have left many persons, despite their diplomas, degrees, and cleverness in mathematics, languages, and physics.

A little survey of well-known historic facts may properly precede discussion and may recall to the reader that the peace movement was not born with the Czar's rescript nor cradled in a Carnegie Peace Endowment. We pass by the sublime, prophetic visions of Isaiah and Micah, the heavenly wisdom of the gospels, the centuries of early Christian non-resistance, when the Church grew apace until political power and prosperity degraded it, to the time of Dante's boyhood, when there appeared, in the beautiful old city of Coutances in Normandy, a young lawyer, Pierre Du Bois by name. We know little of this student of Saint Thomas Aquinas, but we do know that before Dante's "De Monarchia" had presented the conception of peace through a world-empire he proposed an international representative organisation. He would have had a congress of princes institute a permanent tribunal of arbitration,

composed of chosen judges, from whom six should be selected to try a case. Six hundred years later, in 1899, the first Hague Conference agreed to practically the same plan as was outlined by the lawyer of Coutances. But in his day the nations were not ready; they must wait. In 1624 "*Le Nouveau Cynée*" (the New Cyneas) by Eméric Crucé, appeared in Du Bois's country, and was the first book that explicitly developed the thought of a regular system of arbitration. It was followed by "*The Great Design*" of Henry IV, published fifty years after his death in the posthumous memoirs of his great minister, the Duke of Sully. This was the first comprehensive scheme in modern history to organise the world. The king or his minister (there is much controversy about it) had planned a federation of the European states, with a central senate and proportionate contributions from the various nations to the common international army and navy, which should insure the substitution of legal methods for the prevailing system of war. Ravallac's dagger, in 1610, frustrated this scheme, just at the time that little John Milton was learning to talk, and Shakespeare had completed his greatest tragedies and was retiring from London to Stratford. The name of the great scholar Erasmus must not be omitted even in the briefest list of workers for world peace.

But the world was still not ready, and its organisation was to be postponed three centuries as a practical political achievement. One class of hideous wrongs, however, could be ameliorated. Five years after the little band of English exiles coming out of Holland had reared their first log cabin beside Plymouth Rock, the greatest scholar and benefactor whom that same brave little Holland ever produced published an epoch-making book—"The Rights of War and Peace." On July 4, 1899, the hundred diplomats assembled at the first Hague Conference, led by the head of our American delegation, Dr. Andrew D. White, travelled together to ancient Delft and, after gazing on the noble statue of Hugo Grotius which adorns the square, entered the great bare church where Grotius lies buried. As each national group arrived, their ears were greeted by the organ notes of their own national air. There, in an august company, they gathered around the marble monument while the representatives from America in behalf of their Government and people laid a superb silver wreath upon it, as Ambassador White delivered a eulogy on the immense service which this great soul had wrought for all mankind.

The prodigious learning of this great scholar, who was sought by the elegant young Milton on his visit to Paris because he said he venerated him more than any other living man, and the cumulative force of his legal and ethical arguments, reinforced by copi-

ous citations from the ancients, gradually produced a marvellous effect on an age accustomed to savage butchery in war, in which neither age nor sex nor the helplessness of wounded and prisoners had availed to secure either justice or clemency. The world may thank Hugo Grotius primarily for the kindly treatment which, in recent wars, Americans gave to Spanish prisoners and Japanese gave to Russians.

"The Rights of War and Peace" was the first great attempt to deduce a principle of right and a philosophic basis for society independent of biblical and ecclesiastical authority. It had an immediate effect all over Europe. Gustavus Adolphus is said to have slept during his campaigns with a copy under his head of this great work by the man who is properly called "the father of International Law."

His unlearned but ardent contemporary in England, George Fox, born three years before the publication of "The Rights of War and Peace," began a movement as permanent as the influence of this book. In his quaint suit of leather, this preacher of the inner light fared up and down the city streets during the Civil War boldly proclaiming, "Woe, woe to the bloody city." He and the great body of Friends, his followers, like the early Christian martyrs, endured dungeons and stripes and persecution of every kind, but they stood steadfast in their faith, fighting with their tongues, which sometimes were

sharp indeed, and receiving the appellation, "Quakers," because they made the enemies of peace to quake, not because they themselves had faltered. A few of them later, founding the City of Brotherly Love, treated the natives of the New World so justly that, as every schoolboy knows, they had their reward in long years of peace.

A half century rolled on after the appearance of Grotius's great book and the beginning of Fox's preaching, and this time a follower of Fox, another Englishman, the high-bred scholar and New World pioneer, William Penn, the founder of that Philadelphia, presented a scheme for "The Present and Future Peace of Europe." This plan was for a general alliance or compact among the different states of Europe to form a Diet or Congress of Nations. Unlike the Great Design of the French king, this was the first scheme free from suspicion of ulterior motive and inspired purely by love of humanity. But still the nations were not ready.

The profoundest philosophic word of the eighteenth century about the great problem that made Franklin declare "there never was a good war nor a bad peace" was uttered by Immanuel Kant, the master mind of Germany, in his essay on Eternal Peace, published at the very time that our Constitution had made our little group of thirteen states already a world power. Kant's great insight was

that the world's peace can never be permanently attained until the world is organised, and it can never be safely organised until its constituent nations have achieved self-government. In his day any degree of representative government was the rare exception. Even Great Britain's House of Commons, so late as 1866, represented only one man in four. World organisation, had it been possible in Kant's day, would have been chiefly a compact between monarchs, and the only peace obtained would have been that in which the mighty dominate the weak—a peace that portends slavery or revolution. In the period which has elapsed since the sage of Königsberg taught the world the secrets of the starry heavens and of the mind of man, as well as the principles of peace with justice, scarcely a single independent nation has been left which has not achieved, however feebly, some form of representative government. The immobile Orient has awakened, Turkey is striding ahead, and the aroused patriotism of China demands liberty and a republic. The world has witnessed a silent revolution in the minds of men more stupendous and far-reaching than perhaps all that the previous thousand years had wrought. The master minds of physics in the realm of invention have almost annihilated time and space and have brought reports to every breakfast table of yesterday's doings in Tokio, Melbourne,

and Constantinople. No longer is it necessary to chronicle the words, "And still the nations are not ready, but must wait," for now the fulness of time has come and a united world is a practical necessity. Its prototype in the United States has been tested for over a century and a quarter.

When Washington, Franklin, Madison, and their great compeers, less than a hundred in all, sat down in that fateful summer of 1787 behind locked doors in Independence Hall in the City of Brotherly Love to wrestle with their problem, they were helping to solve, all unwittingly, not their own problem alone, but that of the whole world. The group of thirteen quarrelsome colonies, bound by a rope of sand, seemed approaching dissolution. So tense was hostility between Connecticut and New York, for instance, due among other things to the latter's custom duties at her border line, that in one town the merchants banded themselves together to forbid any citizen carrying over merchandise into New York for a year, under penalty of paying two hundred and fifty dollars fine. The citizens of Maine and Georgia were much farther apart in sympathy than are those of Canada and New Zealand to-day. The sailboat and camel—the conveyances of Pharaoh and Alexander—and the little four-page newspaper were all that served as mediums between them. How little those bewigged giants of statesmanship,

HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

sitting in that classic hall, could realise how the little candle they were lighting was to become the great torch of liberty enlightening the whole world, throwing its beams to far Cathay and waking the myriads from slumber, lightening the gloom of suffering millions the world over, by showing where to find the key to unlock prison bars! They thought only of the task in hand; but, in solving the problem of creating a United States, they also showed the essential method of creating a United World.

The glory of our government and our people is that, more than any other on God's earth, have they been able to contribute to humanity the secret of attaining peace with justice. The latest critic of the Supreme Court, that most original feature of the mighty work which the Constitutional Convention created, has said: "In the only opportunity ever given the Supreme Court to prevent war, it failed." Is not the accusation false to history? Did the Court ever fail to do what it was created to do? Despite interstate quarrels, sometimes concerning boundary lines, vital interests, and honour, it has from the beginning settled quietly, one after another, the numerous differences arising between states which, unsettled, would have meant war. Forty-eight states from the Atlantic to the Pacific, containing now one hundred and twenty millions of people, have had peace and justice around the border

lines of each, notwithstanding the reckless riots, the murders, lynchings, and disorders that have disgraced civilisation within those borders. The one instance referred to as a "failure," when half the country was ready to rise in arms to overthrow the national government, was in the nature of the case one with which no court was meant to cope. The critic's further inference that the Hague Court would fail when tested on a serious issue, could apply only when, following the analogy, one half of the world should find itself fundamentally and bitterly opposed to the other half and should choose universal war rather than reason. If such an unthinkable insanity should ever wipe out civilisation, naturally the Hague Court of Arbitration and the newer Permanent Court of International Justice would fail, but only if either had once become the acknowledged arbiter between governments.

The first Peace Society the world ever saw was founded in 1815. When the New York merchant, David Low Dodge, established this first Peace Society, he made membership in a Christian church a pre-requisite to membership in his society; and the peace movement in America and England has been essentially a Christian movement ever since, though naturally, except at the beginning, it has made no such condition of membership. Almost invariably the Hebrews the world over are counted among the

friends of peace, and on the continent of Europe the ablest of the free-thinkers are often found to be ardent workers for peace. Following the leadership of David Low Dodge, the noble ancestor of illustrious descendants, and in the same year, the Massachusetts Peace Society was started in Boston by Noah Worcester and William Ellery Channing. In these days of international courts and conferences and the League of Nations, which seem to novices in world affairs to have sprung up full-fledged in the last fifteen years, it is well for students to turn back to the heroes and pioneers who in New England thought out the methods of world organisation and international justice before the present actors in the world's great drama were born. They died before they saw the fruition of their toil and tears and hopes; but the statesmen who met at the Hague Conference in 1899 owed their success largely to these men, who had in the thirties and forties marked out what came to be known in Europe as the "American plan." William Ladd, whose work indeed deserves a monument, must in this brief survey be passed with no adequate word of eulogy. Charles Sumner, who was as valiant a champion of peace as he was of the abolition of slavery, in three powerful addresses, and especially in "The True Grandeur of Nations," said almost all that could be said before those later special contributions to the subject by

Jean de Bloch, Novicow, Norman Angell, Elihu Root and a host of modern students based upon our new conditions.

Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith," a marvellous self-made scholar with the heart of a child, brought about cheap ocean postage and, working untiringly both at home and in Europe, shared with his great contemporaries, Cobden, Bright, Richard, Victor Hugo, in the great task of stirring the nations still suffering from Napoleon's exhausting wars. Upon the centenary of Burritt's birth, in 1910, the polyglot city of New Britain in Connecticut, where he was born and where his body lies, closed banks and shops and schools, and forty nationalities in native costumes, marching with banners and their national music in high festival, celebrated the birth of him who, of all citizens of his state, had best illustrated the meaning of the motto on the great banner flung that day to the breeze, "Above all nations is humanity." To Elihu Burritt more than to any other was due the success of the great International Peace Congresses in Europe in the middle of the last century.

The Crimean War, in which Lord Salisbury later said that England "placed her money on the wrong horse," our Civil War, and the wars in Italy, Austria, France, and Germany, delayed for thirty years the advance of the peace movement. In 1889

HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

a man of lowly birth, who had known the sharpness of poverty, founded an institution more powerful for the accomplishment of international peace and progress than any other before 1919 except the Hague Conferences. William Randall Cremer, a member of Parliament, afterward knighted for his achievement, initiated the Interparliamentary Union, composed of members of the world's parliaments, which deals with all questions of public international law that concern the maintenance of peace. To-day this organisation, numbering over three thousand members, has brought the peace movement into the realm of practical politics. Its chief early accomplishment was the presentation to the Interparliamentary Conference in 1895 of the draft for the organisation of a Permanent Court of Arbitration. To a large extent this work was later adopted by the first Hague Conference.*

In 1896, Alfred Nobel of Sweden, the inventor of dynamite, died, leaving most of his great fortune to establish five annual prizes, amounting to nearly forty thousand dollars each, to be given to such persons as had done the most important work for literature, chemistry, physics, medicine, and peace: the peace prize is awarded by the Norwegian Storting.

* The Interparliamentary Union meets annually in the different capitals. Its executive authorities are the Interparliamentary Council, composed of two delegate members from each national group and an executive committee of five members.

A Nobel Institute was established in Christiania, whither the winner of the peace prize each year is supposed to repair and deliver an address. Some years the prize has not been awarded. In some cases it has been divided. Among the recent recipients are M. Briand and Herr Streseman. The provision for a peace prize was due to the influence of Nobel's friend, Baroness von Suttner of Vienna, author of "Lay Down Your Arms," a book translated into many languages, which, with her many other writings and addresses, made her a leading factor in the peace movement for thirty years. The list of recipients of the Nobel Peace prizes includes Theodore Roosevelt, Elihu Root and Woodrow Wilson.

One of the notable benefactors of the cause of peace was Albert K. Smiley, who every year for twenty years from 1895 generously entertained as his guests for a three-day conference in the spring-time hundreds of the most able and eminent men of all professions and large business interests. The famous Mohonk Arbitration Conferences were held in the great assembly parlour of his hotel beside a beautiful lake near the Catskills, and presented every subject connected with the judicial settlement of international affairs. Among its presiding officers for years at a time were such men as Senator Edmunds, Hon. John W. Foster, Judge George Gray, and President Butler of Columbia University. In

HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

the early days, the most notable figure in the conferences was the venerable author of "The Man Without a Country." At the first session in 1895 Edward Everett Hale sounded the watchword which he reiterated with emphasis year after year: "We must have a permanent international Tribunal of Arbitration, a permanent Tribunal, a permanent Tribunal"; the notable participants in these unique conferences were Justice Brewer, Cardinal Gibbons, Hon. Oscar Straus, Hon. Andrew D. White, President Charles W. Eliot, Wu Ting Fang, Hague Court judges, among a host of captains of industry, bankers, governors, admirals, generals, and distinguished foreigners from every land.

The first man to pledge a large amount to the cause of international peace was Mr. Edwin Ginn, the well-known publisher of Boston. In November of 1910 his World Peace Foundation, previously known as the International School of Peace, was incorporated and received an ultimate endowment of \$1,000,000. This Foundation issues a series of invaluable pamphlets published regularly and embodying the results of great research on current international affairs. They supply colleges and students with data on all branches of international relations. The Foundation is the American agent for all publications of the League of Nations, the International Labor Office and the World Court

reports and it is carrying on much educational work in making the activities and accomplishments of world organisations known to the public.

Mr. Ginn's endowment was followed a year later by a gift from Andrew Carnegie of \$10,000,000 to establish the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. This gift followed Mr. Carnegie's previous gifts of \$1,500,000 for the Peace Palace at the Hague; of \$5,000,000 for Heroes of Peace in America, and of \$1,250,000 in Great Britain; of \$1,000,000 in France, \$1,250,000 in Germany and \$1,790,000 in smaller countries for the same purpose. Mr. Carnegie also gave \$850,000 for the building and beautification of the grounds of the Pan-American Union in Washington and \$1,000,000 for the erection of the Central American Court in Costa Rica. One gift which has perhaps produced the largest results was \$2,000,000 for the Church Peace Union in which Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jew combine to promote peace activities in the religious world and, through the World Alliance to Promote International Friendship Through the Churches, is reaching out all over Europe, bringing former enemies and people of different creeds to confer together to promote good will. French and German, British and Austrian, Anglican and Greek archbishops have met on common ground and in great conferences in the European capitals. All over our

HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

land in great city churches and in little rural meeting houses, Christians are learning of the progress of the League of Nations, the decisions of the World Court, and children are learning of their little brown cousins beyond seas; and every church is asked to have a permanent committee on International Friendship, for which Edward Everett Hale set the example a generation ago.

The headquarters of the Carnegie Peace Endowment are in Washington * with the division of Intercourse and Education in New York City. Its first chairman was Elihu Root, who was followed by President Butler of Columbia University. Among the distinguished men who have served the Endowment are Dr. James Brown Scott, Professor John B. Clark, and Professor James T. Shotwell. The Foundation deals with international law, economics, and education. In Paris it has handsome European headquarters. The directors have undertaken important and extensive enterprises, among others, sending scores of professors and editors to London, Paris, the Hague, Geneva, and elsewhere to study world affairs and stimulate their work. The directors provide for the carrying on of an Institute of International Law at the Hague every summer; for the publication in French of the periodical *The International Mind*,

* See Appendix.

and for a vast amount of research regarding the World War. It has devoted part of its funds to reconstruction in Belgium.

A movement of promise is that of the Cosmopolitan Clubs, which, from a little club of students in 1903, has developed into a body of importance, representing about fifty different countries. The modest beginning was in the apartment of a Japanese student in the University of Wisconsin, where was founded an International Club of sixteen foreign and two native students. As one studies the faces of these picked men in some club group, future leaders of science and politics in China, Japan, Brazil, Mexico, India, the Philippines, South Africa, and South America, as well as the frank, alert faces of our native collegians, one realises that the club, like similar ones elsewhere, is a melting pot for the elimination of prejudice, suspicion, and indifference. These men by the common bond of intellectual interests and common recreation, are coming, without any loss of patriotism as concerns their native lands, to think of themselves as first of all citizens of the world, members of the brotherhood of man. The beautiful and spacious International House, erected by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., opposite Grant's tomb in New York, is a centre for international student activities which, with a similar house given by the same generous donor to the University of California,

may produce far-reaching results. This brief survey records only a part of the unofficial work which for a century has begun to show the world that war is a product of confused thinking, and that its extinction does not need to await a change in human nature. A discussion of the history of official action for international peace will be discussed in a later chapter.

In this outline, which is chiefly prepared for American readers, no effort has been made to summarise the work of peace societies in other countries, but in many countries the work has been and is being promoted with great devotion and high intelligence, and some of the European peace journals are of marked significance. The English Peace Society was organised in 1816, the next year after the founding of the New York and Massachusetts societies here.

CHAPTER II

EDUCATION AND WORLD PEACE

As the world's future depends largely upon the psychology in the making in a few leading countries, what millions of American children are now being taught about human relationships may shape world policies and create ruin or prosperity. European university students during the post-war period have suffered greatly from privation, from depleted libraries and laboratories, and from poverty-stricken professors' inability to do their former work of research. Additional obligations are therefore thrown on all American scholarship to help atone for the enormous loss to the world of culture. Few things are more important than supplying our 700,000 teachers with the special kind of help they need to enable them to cope with imperative new demands. For a century before the war ambitious minds were intoxicated with the marvellous output of science and invention. Commerce and mechanics absorbed attention, and we had little insight into international relationships and the most vital human problems. This was true of every country, and the log-

ical outcome was the World War. Its tumultuous aftermath has produced many bewildered minds unable to instruct that large part of the rising generation which is greedily feeding at the mental garbage pail provided by the enormous number of sensational and vulgar periodicals that fill the news stands.

Post-war education needs to differ materially from that provided a generation ago for those in Europe whose lack of vision brought on the greatest calamity the world has known. Our people learned how to spell pterodactyl, to locate the Xingu River, to remember the number killed at Bennington; but millions of them left school believing that trade followed the flag, that another nation's poverty was our opportunity, that patriotism meant supporting an administration's policy, right or wrong, and that what was wrong for an individual was right for a nation. Teachers themselves believed that there was such a thing as French trade, German trade, Russian trade. They did not know what every twelve-year-old should be taught, that individuals, not nations, trade. The German who sells dye-stuffs or optical instruments is not a rival of the Russian who sells wheat or furs or oil; nor of the Frenchman who manufactures silk or perfumes or wine, or of the Englishman who sells coal or cotton cloth. His greatest competitor may live across the street. One of the most deep-rooted causes of the

war was lack of elementary knowledge of international economics.

Life and death and the future of civilisation depend upon ideas. The chief thing that has made for progress has been clear thought. Does not even good will come second? For unless one first sees what is good to do, he may with the best intentions support very fanatical and dangerous policies, as Soviet Russia has shown. The devil loves to lurk behind a pious mask. It is under the claim of preserving peace that the most blatant and sophistical arguments are presented for more devilish mechanical devices to destroy men whom lack of statesmanship has turned into enemies. Yet there was never an age when world peace was so possible and the agencies for it so far advanced. Our national contribution to world peace depends largely on the power of certain groups of so-called patriotic societies to impose the old Prussian conception of nationalism upon the American people, and of the power of certain newspapers with enormous circulation to befuddle the minds of the electorate.

The yet unfledged voters in our High Schools need, more than any details about civics or history, to have burnt into their consciousness the fact that all human beings are interdependent and since the Industrial Revolution have come into a new relation to each other. The machinery of government and facts

about elections can be looked up at any time in a reference book; these are only means to an end. The end is to get sound judgment about public policies and the will to serve. Old prejudices, traditions, and newspaper headlines form the basis of the judgment of millions of voters. Their minds are lumber rooms of facts huddled together without order or system. They have a morbid fear of not being loyal to their own. That means that one must vote a straight party ticket every time. What is needed is the true sportsman spirit at the Harvard-Yale game; to care more for a clean game, even if it goes against one's own side, than to have one's own side win, if it has slugged or fouled with its policies and slogans. Does not loyalty to truth often lead one to vote with one party in a national election and with another in a state election? Loyalty to country instead of party will create the fine type of independent voter which will bring both parties to a higher standard.

The need of understanding something of world history if one is to understand one's own, is generally recognised; but the need of considering one's own political history in its relation to economic and vital statistics and moral principles is less understood. The High School student leaves school usually grossly unprepared to make sound judgments on public issues. Especially is he unable to judge matters which appeal to the emotions, like

questions of danger and defence. He knows something of cryptograms, ventricles, *orati obliqua*, queens of England, but does not know that these matters are but trivial compared with the weightier matter of human relations. Questions presented to many tens of thousands of students during a period of ten years have elicited the information that the very great majority imagine that foreigners in the course of our history have slain no less than two million Americans. These students were from twelve to nineteen years of age. Their text-books had never given any of the pertinent facts that would profoundly affect their attitude toward danger and defence from foreigners. They have never learned that every year automobiles destroy more citizens than did all foreigners in our first four wars beginning with the Revolution: that more have been murdered here in ten years than those slain in our five foreign wars combined.

Until pupils are taught always to think of using facts comparatively, and are given the facts that need to be compared, can their judgment on vital matters that affect their future and their taxes be anything more than the result of impulse, tradition, and prejudice? Let a page of essential facts now omitted from our text-books be inserted in each new edition.

Imagination should be encouraged quite as much

in the study of arithmetic as in poetry. Teachers are usually content with accuracy and speed, and leave pupils absolutely unable to visualise figures as applied to areas, population, and money. Lack of imagination is being recognised by psychologists as a serious defect in students in business colleges. Those who can perform problems, make schedules, draw up statistics, often have little power to visualise human beings, or human relationships as affected by them, or the relation of one set of figures to another in terms of obligation or of opportunity. In respect to imagination, it is a question whether the banker is better off than the average man who deals very little with figures. How many who can figure cleverly and swiftly have the imagination to conceive what figures mean when applied to human needs? The men who brought on the war were trained to extract cube root, and to go through other processes which not one in a thousand ever subsequently used, but they were left to grow up to voting age grotesquely fancying that anything to make money circulate rapidly helped prosperity, no matter what was produced; though money can circulate as rapidly in making bullets as in making bread. They imagined that we had a "good balance of trade" if we exported for gold three times as much as we received in imports; that by leaving our customers and debtors to become paupers in fighting out their

“squabbles,” we can get markets and reparations. Does not the rising generation need to learn what the unstable dollar has done and still is doing to complicate the problem of individual and national debts; what injustice and suffering have resulted in the enormous changes in the purchasing power of the dollar, and what relationship this problem has to national prosperity and world peace? Is it not of more practical importance for British boys to know that Great Britain had not paid off her Napoleonic war debts when she embarked in war in 1914, and that the interest on them had about doubled the original amount, than to know about the wives of Henry VIII or the wars of the Spanish Succession? It would have been useful for them to have figured in relation to their father’s income what it meant for Great Britain in 1880 to pay out of 84,000,000 pounds sterling, 73,000,000 pounds for army and navy and interest on debt; what it signified when the Boer War wiped out the savings of the country for thirty-six years. It would be well for American children to learn this year’s annual budget and that we are spending nearly four-fifths of it on something connected with war, past, present or future. Every child should be taught to work out problems whose terms should incidentally convey a vast deal that he needs to know. Let him figure how long it would take men of different

salaries, from those of a letter carrier up to that of a corporation lawyer or bank president, to earn a million dollars. The cost of his town or city hall, his school, his church, might be ascertained and taken as a norm for calculations. A clear conception of these matters would help give some faint comprehension of the significance of our national expenditure, and of our country's needs, and what it means when our annual budget is reckoned in billions and our annual loss by crime about equals it. The child should learn that great wealth is not produced by mere thrift, and this might set him to considering the bases of great fortunes, and the relation of great fortunes to tariffs and to special privilege, to private seizure of national resources, and the relation of national expenditure to war.

Is not knowledge of our national faults and acquaintance of others' opinion of us an essential step toward creating a proper understanding of other people? Nearly ninety years ago Hegel in his "Philosophy of History" remarked upon the preponderance in the United States of *private* interest, and maintained that "respect for law exists apart from genuine probity, and the American merchants lie under the imputation of dishonest dealings under legal protection." How are children who daily hear of a "four thousand dollar clergyman," "a fifty thousand dollar lawyer," a "ten thousand dollar

engagement ring," "a million dollar bride," a "hundred million dollar baby," a "billion dollar captain of high finance," to perceive relative values in other terms than coin? Athletics seems almost the only popular field excepted from the financial blight. Must not development of a true spirit of international ethics go hand in hand with the development of a true spirit of civic and national patriotism? The school must not only develop the growing consciousness of the family of nations, but must probably be the chief instrument in its realisation; for it is largely an intellectual matter, and, therefore, something which neither church nor home is usually fitted to teach as well as the school. Many a father who is devoted to family and church and country, is a rank sceptic as to any possibility of ever ending war and is confident that only a great navy can protect his country from invasion. The curl of the lip in contempt, the careless expletive, "a tricky Jap," "a Greaser," "a Hun" may, like a poisonous germ, infect some little mind and demand much skilful treatment from the teacher before it is eradicated. In Parent Teachers' Associations, few matters are of more consequence than suggestions to parents as to ways in which to develop the consciousness of human solidarity and interdependence. Let children learn from the start how many things enrich their lives which come from every land, from the coffee and

grapefruit on the breakfast table to the Bible and Shakespeare and a large share of the books and pictures in the home.

The American School Citizenship League, formerly known as the School Peace League, has with meagre funds been attempting a scientific aid to teachers for nearly twenty years. The logical development of the international viewpoint is presented in a Course in Citizenship and Patriotism, prepared by pedagogical experts in the League who are masters of the philosophy and technique of teaching ethics and citizenship. Chief Justice Taft in his introduction to this Course in Citizenship, which is prepared for primary and grammar grades, said: "There are much needed lessons in this book to impress upon the youth who are to receive them the idea that we are not the only people in the world; that we should earnestly cultivate friendship and sympathy with other peoples. These lessons will also arouse the proper aspiration for a settlement of international disputes by peaceable means." The true story of one's country becomes linked with that of other countries. In every grade little ways of helpfulness are taught, and a sense of responsibility developed from the start. The contribution of each race to American life is shown and the whole series of talks and suggestions culminates in the higher grades, when the thought of the world family and

our relationship to humanity emphasises Bishop Brent's trenchant statement in a recent address: "The true citizen to-day is a citizen of the world and his first loyalty is to mankind. Patriotism comes as a second loyalty, to be checked, disciplined, and determined by the first and larger loyalty." This is a hard saying for "patrioteers" who have never learned the truth of Lowell's noble poem, "The Fatherland."

The essay contests arranged by the American School Citizenship League enlist the attention of hundreds of competitors in lands all over the globe in Normal and High Schools and Colleges. The subjects announced every year require research, and study of world organisation and all that contributes to international good will. The celebration of Good Will Day, May 18th, the anniversary of the opening of the first Hague Conference, is focussing attention of young people everywhere on one day in the year which people of every land can celebrate together. Internationalism can properly exist only as it is based on a true spirit of nationalism. Hostility to the word has been engendered by those who assumed that it weakened the spirit of patriotism. Love of humanity no more weakens love of country, than that weakens love of one's own family. No one is fitted for twentieth-century problems who has not transcended the viewpoint of the American

who, before the Civil War, declared: "My first allegiance is to Harford County, my second to the state of Maryland, my third to the United States." Just as the old states'-rights doctrine is now everywhere transcended, so must the narrow nationalism that post-war reaction has created be transcended. The child must be taught that he is first of all a human being, a citizen of the world, a child of God. The great internationalists—Dante, Lessing, Kant, Mazzini, Victor Hugo, Sumner, Hale—were always the most intense of patriots; seeing that only by the perfecting of their own nation could the nation serve as leader and benefactor among the peoples of the earth, thus satisfying Emerson's noble definition: "The right patriotism is the delight which springs from contributing our peculiar and legitimate advantage to the benefit of humanity." Only teachers with lofty souls can inculcate this type of patriotism. The noisy and spectacular side of patriotism elates the crowd, but it leaves the shallow mind inert and apathetic when the real test comes in that civic drudgery which wins no medals, title, gold lace, or pensions and gives only the quiet satisfaction of saving fellow men from accident and death; saving forests and waterpower from extinction; preventing waste and suffering by the public; and creating beauty, happiness and health for multitudes who may take it all for granted and even give no thanks.

Says Professor Lindeman: "Our attempts to become educated are confined to a few breathless years of fact-hunting after which we settle down to some form of collecting dollars, automobiles, and satisfactions. Guidance for the state is left at loose ends. We have concentrated attention on inventing democratic machinery for selecting leaders and forthwith left them to function automatically. We devised checks and balances instead of ways and means . . . The spirit which prizes liberty is at low ebb and, as Lincoln foresaw, when we have destroyed this spirit we have planted the seeds of despotism at our doors. Privileges will need to be sacrificed, institutions reshaped, for these are instruments, means toward ends. Man is himself the end, and when institutions stand in the way of his aspirations they must be cast aside." No modern state has previously put into a legal system all the things desired. A capitalist state like ours, spite of our Constitution which can be circumvented, might easily in a crisis adopt much of the Fascist doctrine. We admire efficiency and Fascism accomplishes that. It is quite in harmony with the smug nationalism, and centralised power and intolerance that have developed in so many countries since the war. When democracy fails, as the non-voting half of our population are trying to make it fail, we may find capitalism demanding Fascist principles to secure quickly

desired results. Democratic methods are slower. Said Viscount Grey: "We have lived on to-day into an epoch which regards democratic, representative government as on its trial. Its merits and efficiency are questioned when we are engaged in establishing it. In some countries, democratic representative government is no longer regarded as an ideal at all."

Must not Normal students who are busy learning how to teach punctuation, algebra, and botany, if they are to gain a perception of relative values, perceive that, first and foremost, they must learn how to preserve democracy and to save the State? Is any matter which requires trained judgment more important than the vital question of "preparedness"?

CHAPTER III

PREPAREDNESS

No greater lesson has Emerson taught the world than that nothing can be known except as it is seen in its relations. A thing is large or small, important or unimportant, only as it is contrasted with other things. We do not know whether our own car is moving, if the one beside us moves, until we look out on solid ground.

Preparedness and defence are good words but they mean nothing until they are compared with danger. It is time that they ceased to be monopolised by the army and navy and were put to larger service. All wise persons believe in prudence and foresight and preparedness for anything that is likely to threaten. The common phrase "adequate preparedness," on the lips of every military man, means nothing whatever until one is told what the preparedness is for. What is adequate for one condition is inadequate for another. Germany had an army adequate to fight two others, but not to cope with a larger coalition. No nation ever can be prepared for all conceivable danger.

Does not the kind of preparedness and the amount of preparedness that every nation needs, depend on the degree of danger and the kind of danger existing? A rocky coast needs many lighthouses; a safe coast, few. Berlin, which is practically fireproof, requires few fire-engines, and is proud of having fewer than our flimsily built cities necessitate. A nation that has little danger from without should rejoice if it needs few battleships; nothing except dire danger can excuse the taxation of the toilers of the world for more cruisers. Some years ago when our navy cost much less than it does now, an American admiral, resenting protests against spending money on the navy, asked, "Why does not the speaker turn his attention to the waste of six hundred million dollars by fires which a proper civilisation would prevent? Expenditure upon the navy is but a triviality compared with that." A singular comparison, indeed! One may compare one evil with another, or one preventive with another; but if a navy is supposed to be a preventive of war, should not its cost be compared with the cost of the preventives of fire, not with the loss by fire?

In arraigning our extravagance and waste the admiral might have gone further, and reminded us that we are the most homicidal of civilised nations. We have murdered, in every million citizens, 129 in one year, while in that same year across the border

in Canada, only three out of every million were murdered. We are the most wasteful and extravagant people on the earth. Before the war we destroyed 60,000 more lives by accident in four years than died by bullets on the Union side in four years of Civil War. Deaths in our country from automobiles cost yearly more lives than did the battles in our first four foreign wars—a fact not to be surmised from historical text-books. We destroy by fire seven times as much yearly as does all Europe. This has been said to equal the cost of half the new buildings erected annually in the United States. Said Professor Giddings of Columbia University: “For three hundred years we have been a herd of wild asses in the wilderness. There have been other herds in other lands but no other has accomplished an equal amount of damage in so short a time.” Our civic corruption, colossal land-thefts, our growing imperialisms and admiration for the huge and costly as contrasted with the fitting and beautiful, have amazed Europe. A common question is whether Americans are not chiefly Babbitts, and care most of all for material things. One-quarter of our soldiers in 1917 were found unable to read a newspaper in English; and in 1918 we had still 5,000,000 illiterates; yet with ignorance, recklessness, waste, preventable disease, accident, and crime attacking

our fair land, men in power are spending their chief thought on possible enemies overseas.

Since our republic was founded no nation has declared war against us. Said Secretary Charles E. Hughes in 1925: "So far as we can see into the future, the United States is not in the slightest danger of aggression. In no single power and in no possible combination of powers lies any menace to our security."

In three foreign wars, the War of 1812, and the wars with Mexico and Spain, combined, including the Philippine adjunct to our Spanish war, we lost less than *fifteen thousand men by foreign bullets*. For previous past wars before the World War, and for preparation for future war, the United States was paying about seventy cents out of every dollar of its income, though without an enemy in the world. Let one imagine a householder spending seventy cents out of every dollar on stonewalls, bulldogs, burglar alarms, and moats, and having only thirty cents on every dollar left for family needs; that is what we pay for Congress, the President, the cabinet, federal judges, federal prisons, custom house buildings and officers, post office buildings in every city, coast-guard, light-houses, census, printing, diplomatic and consular service, forestry, waterways, quarantine, irrigation, agricultural and other depart-

ments, mints, etc. After the World War we had only fifteen cents on the dollar to spend for these purposes.

Said John Ruskin: "It is a state of mind very much to be dreaded for a man not to know the devil when he sees him." Is it not a state of mind still more to be dreaded when a nation does not know its real enemies from bogies? Despite the fact that for thirty years before the Civil War, and from 1872 to 1898, we had a small navy, we were a real and great world power; our democracy, as James Russell Lowell said, was undermining every monarchy in Europe. We did not first become a world power when Dewey sank a few old Spanish ships. Ever since the Constitution was ratified and began to serve as the basis of the dozens of national constitutions written since, we have been a world power, and have been recognised as such. It was once our pride and glory that we need not burden ourselves with the millstone of militarism that the great powers of Europe had hung around their throats. To-day, with our new militarism and demand for a great navy and, under the clamour of vested interests which want contracts for manufacture of military equipments, are we not following Old World methods, without Old World excuses? A spirit of vain emulation has been goading us to increase of armaments out of all proportion to our needs. For

over a hundred years, we as a world power, though with a very small navy, were unassailed. Since the World War our vaulting ambition has demanded that we have a navy equal to any on the earth. Since the destruction of Germany's navy, Great Britain has been willing to abandon her two-power navy and permit ours to equal hers; but are not our dangers only a fraction of her dangers and does not our navy far exceed our need of defence? Great Britain depends on her merchant marine for food, and one-third of her people would starve or be forced to emigrate if her supplies from overseas were cut off. She is within gunshot of the continent. Her coastline, including her possessions, is twice our own. We on the other hand, safe between two oceans, can feed ourselves, have immense resources, and are not in the slightest danger of invasion. All this is sedulously ignored when the demands for annual appropriations are presented. Has a navy any more to do with the dignity of a country than have fire-engines or life-saving stations? As to wealth, the richer the country, the better customer it is, and the less likely to be attacked by other nations which want customers. The wealthier a country the sooner can it buy ships and ammunition in sudden exigency. The advice given college Freshmen by a United States Senator to take military training was because "we are a rich country and others are poor and jeal-

ous and may attack us." This idea is constantly repeated. It is assumed that we can keep off marauders only by guns and bombs. What affects individuals and nations is confounded. An individual's house may be looted if he stores up precious, portable material. Bandits may overpower men carrying pay-rolls. A certain factory in Nevada was in great danger, until it paid its people in checks, not cash. But our nation's wealth is in its inventive, clever brains, its fields of grain, in mines and oil-wells, in skyscrapers, factories, public buildings, waterpower, railroads; these possessions are not portable. The fact that some revengeful nation might bomb New York and do great damage is theoretically true, but it would have nothing to gain. Even if a coalition tried it, they would simply destroy the goose that lays the golden egg, and could no longer help their needs by borrowing. It is such fantastic bugaboos as this which militarists and the jingo press conjure up that terrorise the masses and induce them to rely on steel and bombs instead of treaties to secure defence.

China was not only the inventor of gunpowder, but has been conspicuously the employer of a force which, when widely adopted by the western world, may prove more efficacious for defence than the explosive which the nations so readily accepted and employed. Even a few unorganised Chinese mer-

chants, unsupported by their government, were able, in a nation without a navy, to bring to some measure of justice our great nation with a navy second only to England's, when their boycott of our goods, a few years ago, wrought havoc in the cotton trade. Their later boycott of Japanese goods quietly secured certain desired and just concessions. What would not be the power of 400,000,000 organised Asiatics backed by their government, if, twenty-five years from now, they should unite to refuse to deal with any nation that had wronged them and transfer their trade to a more friendly nation? The mere threat of non-intercourse with any nation by an organised world would be quite adequate; it would never need to be carried into execution, any more than our army is ever called on to enforce the decisions of our Supreme Court. It is the rational, bloodless, and effective weapon suited to an organised world which produces the largest results with the least waste and expense. It is *par excellence* the Christian method. It is the political application of the "shaking the dust off the feet" and "let him be anathema." It is wholly removed from the spirit of violence and revenge, and must not be associated with the sudden, unannounced boycott which often does gross injustice in disputes between labour and capital.

Since Washington's time our population has in-

creased about 28 times, our expense for armaments has increased 650 times, and our area about three to four times. We are told periodically, just before the vote on the naval budget, that Japan has so many hundred thousand soldiers that she can land on our shores, and that we are unprepared for possible dangers. Japan needs no further expansion at this time for she has not yet developed her newly-acquired island of Formosa. Her ambition for expansion is in Manchuria. She would not take the Philippines as a gift. The climate is too hot for her people and she could not afford to fortify them. We have no excuse whatever for suspicion of Japan. She has only too great cause for grievance toward us, even in addition to the groundless and wanton insult to her involved in the action of our Senate in the cancellation of the Gentleman's Agreement touching her trifling immigration to this land. Said a well-known missionary: "When Perry opened Japan to the knowledge and intercourse of Western nations, one thing that shocked the Japanese was the bloody history of these nations on this side of the globe; and one of their greatest moralists expressed this wide feeling when he begged his government to send him on a mission to the West that he might plead with those nations to put an end to the brutal wars which two hundred and fifty years of peace had made Japan profoundly dislike. At the entrance of

countless towns and villages a high flagstaff stands at the base of which is written, "Peace be to this village." Compare the national hymn of Japan with those of the nations of the West. Hymns to be national must express the deepest and strongest sentiment of the nation. Not a shadow of war here. We of the West have to be careful how we sing our national hymns where representatives of different nations are gathered, but Japan's national hymn can be sung anywhere in the world without giving offence. It was the so-called Christian nations that taught the Orient that "to command respect" they must be armed. It was by the guns left over from the World War and sold by people in Christian nations that China's civil war has been carried on.

Confounding defence with armaments, defenders with armies and navies, has befogged the minds of untrained thinkers. Granted that all citizens should defend their motherland. But why assume that there is only one form of defence, and that only armed men are defenders? Women are as responsible as men for national defence. They fight against real enemies which fill our cemeteries with graves. Our navy faces no enemy that wants to attack us as do hunger, microbes, and ignorance, which it is the business of women daily to contend with. The woman stands with the farmer in the front line of national defence. She has a more constructive task

to perform than has any soldier. Her training should be as thorough. The compulsory military training, which our military men desire and are rapidly extending, is focussed on that which has only one object—killing neighbours who have become enemies. There is no objection to compulsory training for both young men and women, provided that each may choose the type of national service which he or she desires. The man who digs iron and coal is doing far more for his country than the man who learns to kill another man. In fact, without miners men would be living in the stone age without a pin, or knife, or nail, to say nothing of a gun. The training which may well be given to and required of all young men and women is that which will help them to fight the perennial enemies—cold, hunger, dirt, poverty, ignorance, vice, disease, and accident. Among the long list of defenders needed to sustain our modern state and guard it from disaster, the least productive and most to be pitied are those innocent youth who are compelled to spend most of their days in non-productive manœuvres and whose work, if it comes, is to slay other youth equally innocent. In criticising our underemphasis upon real dangers and our one-sided use of the term “defence,” no criticism is made of the gallant and able men who silently serve in our army and navy. Let it always be remembered that it is the public, not they, who

are perpetuating the antiquated system of settling questions of justice by dynamite and submarines. Nothing said here is opposed to the idea of national and international force for police purposes.

That "government is based on force" is a conception, which, said Elihu Root, "is less than half a truth." Yet the fallacy is dinned in every ear, and the public seems to have taken this dangerous and sophistical maxim as axiomatic and formerly deduced many irrelevant doctrines from it, including the theory that women should not vote. Said T. W. Higginson: "It is the civilian who rules on the throne or behind it, and who makes the fighting men his mere agents. Yonder policeman at the corner looks big and formidable; he protects the women and overawes the boys. But away in some corner of the City Hall, there is some quiet man out of uniform, perhaps a consumptive, a dyspeptic, or a cripple, who can overawe the burliest policeman by his authority, as city marshal or as mayor."

All governments, to be sure, use force. No government, least of all a republic, is based on force. The weakest government in the world uses proportionally the most force to protect its inherent weakness. Our President needs no guard of thousands of soldiers when he walks the streets, as did the terrified and hated Czar who ruled over 150,000,000 Russians. Our national security against outside at-

tack rests chiefly on the same ground as that of ordinary citizens in ordinary civil life. The chief reason that our neighbours are not committing arson, perjury, and homicide is not because they are afraid of prison cell or hangman's noose. Is it not because their environment, education, and experience have made such crimes loathsome to them, and because they know right well they would have more to lose than gain in the end by turning felons? Only a small minority require the police. Workers for peace, as such, welcome proper preparedness against real dangers, and, when necessary, the use of force; but they sharply distinguish between the kind of force which aims to secure a judicial decision and the kind that aims to settle by lewisite and bombs such questions as boundaries or payment of debts. Navies never compel offenders to go to court. They aim at victory irrespective of justice. When Benjamin Franklin said: "There never was a good war nor a bad peace," he meant that if one side was wholly right, the other must be wholly wrong. Both might be wrong and like two dogs snarling over a bone that belongs to neither; but both could not possibly be right. At most, there could be on both sides only fifty per cent of justice, which could not produce a just war any more than a half-rotten apple could be a good one. Is not any measure of justice that is achieved in war accom-

panied by a thousand injustices toward the innocent? Whatever may be said about revolutions and revolts against tyranny within a country, war to-day between nations stands condemned as futile and abhorrent. It is often assumed that revolutions and revolts are in the same category as civil war. General Pershing once declared that there was "no doubt that the Civil War never would have occurred had the Union been equipped with an army of a reasonable size and ready for immediate use." Yet the committee on naval affairs in February, 1861, reported that we had ample naval preparedness but that "an aristocrat in the cabinet of President Buchanan had seen to it that the navy was scattered to the four winds of heaven." The South was as well equipped as the North. Said the *Mobile Alabama Advertiser*: "We are much obliged to Secretary Floyd for the foresight he has displayed in disarming the North and equipping the South for this emergency. One hundred and thirty-five thousand muskets have been quietly transferred from the northern arsenal at Springfield." There is no telling the quantity of arms and munitions which were sent south from other arsenals. Four men out of seven in the Cabinet were from slave states and one was a northern "copperhead." If the North had been better equipped, the South would have had still better preparation for striking its blow at Bull Run.

In the nature of the case, no government which contains two hostile parties can prepare for civil war without helping the enemy.

Had there been more "preparedness" war would simply have been on a larger scale, or come sooner, as would have been the case had England heeded Lord Roberts's plea twenty years before 1914 for England to create a great army. Does not increase of armaments in one country simply compel more armaments in another? The paradoxical logic is that every nation must be better prepared than every other! America says that her only preparedness is for defence. So say they all, except those who agree with Captain Pye, U. S. N., who boldly declares: "The most effective defence and the one most in keeping with American character is a strong offence. Our policy in war as in business is 'Go get them!'" So said Tirpitz in 1917.

General Pershing held that: "There is little question that under strong leadership the United States could have prevented the World War altogether." One nation's action always affects that of others. Had we in 1914 a trained army of 2,000,000 men, as we are told we should have had, we should have needed years to vote and tax and prepare for it, and we should have been a very different America from what we were. We should have incited more exposed nations, which lacked our enormous natural

assets, to fear us and to strain every nerve to go us one better. The war would doubtless have come sooner, Europe would have been profoundly alarmed and looked with consternation at a nation, safely situated like ours, making anything like the preparations that we did make after we had seen a World War waging for two years. One must reiterate that technical experts are not often statesmen, and have no better knowledge of how human nature will act than have other people. But the deluded public thinks that, because they understand war games and phosgene gas and all the weapons of destruction, they must divine what premiers and parliaments and financiers are doing, and can thus estimate the nature and degree of danger. Is not the problem of preparedness chiefly psychological? Like the problem of witchcraft and slavery, it vanishes when men think clearly and act sanely upon the basis of fact, not tradition or fiction. Few school histories of any country give impartial, unbiased statement of facts, and the real student must seek higher authorities, unafraid of school-boards and publishers, to learn many facts which complacent readers would like to have forgotten.

CHAPTER IV

SOME NEGLECTED FACTS ABOUT OUR WARS

The history of the United States is replete with records of magnificent heroism, courage, and wisdom. The statesmanship of the great founders of the republic, the devotion of pioneers in untrodden paths, and of the men who preserved the Union, ended slavery, and made America for so long the home of the oppressed of all the world, are matters of which all patriots are justly proud. Our country was for a long period the moral and political leader among the nations, the advance guard of all movements for international peace. Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson were known as the peace leaders among world statesmen. But to-day we have begun to substitute for that type of leadership another, based on wealth and material power, coupled with a new and proud spirit of aloofness. An insidious encroachment on the sovereignty of little neighbour states is breeding an alienation from former friends. Let us cherish as our most precious treasure the records of our true nobility and greatness; but let us not, like the ostrich, bury our heads in the sand,

shut our eyes, and refuse to recognise these sorry facts, if we are justly to appraise ourselves and learn how to avoid new blunders. So far as they deal with international relations, all school histories before publication should be criticised by international historical experts. The accomplishment of this is one aim of the World Federation of Education Associations.

There are numerous omissions in American history text-books, which leave pupils utterly in the dark or with distorted views as to many vital matters which vehement Fourth of July orators, who proclaim that we have never fought but for the noblest ends, would have us ignore. In the interest of truth, a few are here suggested which text-book writers who fear school-board judgments frequently omit. Their errors are chiefly not of commission, but of omission, which, however, equally prevent giving a true impression.

Until 1800 history in schools was almost entirely that of Greece and Rome. With the growth of nationalism all nations began inculcating its spirit by writing their own history from their own point of view. There was wide-spread propaganda for patriotism. Professor C. H. Hamlin declares, in "The War Myth in United States History," "Patriotism became international hatred, measured in terms of military service. All nations pictured their

side as defensive; *that its wars are defensive against an offensive enemy is the war myth of every country.*"

The navigation laws, which led to much smuggling by leading New England merchants, were one of the chief causes of the Revolution; the western land restrictions by the British government as regarded their purchase, were another, and also the financial legislation by England which prohibited the colonists' fiat money. The Stamp Act, which is ordinarily understood as accruing to British interest, did not, however, give a penny to England, but was for the support of the colonial army to prevent possible trouble with the Indians and French. The American boycott proved an effective weapon by the colonists in forcing Great Britain to repeal her tariff on imports.

The acts of Great Britain which brought on the war were legal and comported with the spirit of that day, however unjust we feel them to have been. When we criticise taxation without representation we must recall that the great majority of people in England were taxed, but they had no suffrage, and did not achieve suffrage until ninety years after 1776. The colonists were no more unjustly treated in this matter than were the British.

In Great Britain a strong and noble minority, including Burke and Fox, Barre and Pitt, withstood

King George and rejoiced that the colonists had resisted. We have honoured them by giving their names to many towns. Yet three generations followed here who grew up assuming that all Americans were right and all the British wrong. The Revolution, it must be reiterated, was a war between the progressives and reactionaries on both sides the Atlantic. One-third of our Americans remained loyal to King George and suffered grievously. The New York legislature passed a resolution that Tories should be "deemed guilty of treason and should suffer death." They were often tarred and feathered and sometimes killed. New York alone confiscated \$3,600,000 belonging to Tories and all the states did likewise. Although in the final treaty in 1783 restitution to the Tories for confiscated property was agreed to, nothing was done and the agreement became a scrap of paper. With bitterness of heart about 100,000 broke up their homes and emigrated after the war. One event is not often recalled—our attempted invasion of Canada in 1775, after Congress had declared, as seems evident, that they had no intention of doing so.

The Alien and Sedition laws of John Adams's administration were used to promote fearful tyranny, and Jefferson later made shipwreck of them. These laws attacked foreigners especially, and resulted in shameful persecution of harmless people who, as it

has been said, "rallied to the banner of freedom only to find it was not freedom at all." But reaction came against the laws, and persecution defeated its own ends. Our democracy was not then developed. Students in colleges were divided by social rank. Until 1830 property and religious qualifications for the ballot had not been entirely removed. In one state an Episcopalian could hardly hold an office, and in another a Baptist was forbidden to vote. Catholics were ostracised and their churches were burned. Jews were under the ban. Jefferson, the true father of tolerance and democracy, did more than any other to promote the rights of citizens and to banish the blight of bigotry and oppression.

Englishmen as a whole preserved no such grievance as did we. They were embroiled in other wars, and the Revolution was only one among many, while to us it seemed the supreme event. British textbooks stated the case more fairly than did ours. It was largely our false teaching of the history of the Revolution that can account for the startling ebullition of war sentiment during that critical week in 1895, when it seemed as if we might actually declare war against Great Britain over a boundary line in Venezuela that Americans neither knew nor cared about, except as it affected the Monroe Doctrine.

The War of 1812 might not have been fought had

SOME NEGLECTED FACTS ABOUT OUR WARS

there been a cable under the Atlantic, and we had known that Great Britain had withdrawn her Orders in Council which had forbidden trading of neutral nations with France. Our country was divided over this war, though all detested the impressment of American seamen, the numbers of which, however, proved later to have been grossly exaggerated in Madison's estimate; but this impressment was a contributory cause. One real cause of the war, however, as later became apparent, was the desire for western expansion, friction over British trading posts, and a clamour for annexation of Canada.

Though usually credited as a war, in which we gained the victory, the war was a failure. In the treaty which ended it, the claims of both countries were set aside in silence. Professor Muzzey declares the war a "blunder, unnecessary, impolitic, untimely, and rash." General Winfield Scott asserted that the army of officers were "generally sunk in either sloth, ignorance, or habits of intemperate drinking"; they were "swaggerers, dependents, decayed gentlemen, utterly unfit for any military purpose whatever." The United States won no territory that it wanted, did not secure its rights at sea, was defeated in nearly every land campaign; but brilliant naval victories tended to make these facts forgotten.

Our recent painful relations with Latin America

make a reference to our war with Mexico in 1846 of peculiar significance. General Grant who was a young Lieutenant in that war, declared in his Memoirs that it was "one of the most unjust wars ever fought by a stronger against a weaker people." Daniel Webster, Charles Sumner, Emerson, Lowell, Whittier, all the best elements in New England, strongly opposed the war, which, more than any other war, belied the boastful assertion made at a military convention in Washington in 1926: "The Government of the United States has never unfurled its battle flag for conquest or aggression, but only in defence of human rights."

Charles Sumner in a lengthy Report on the War with Mexico traced the history of its origin and said: "The grand, compelling motive was the desire to extend the institution of slavery." He quoted Secretary Upsher's protest against the abolition of domestic slavery in Texas: "If Texas should not be attached to the United States, she can not maintain that institution (slavery) ten years." Sumner wrote the following "Resolves concerning the Mexican War and the Institution of Slavery" which in part are here quoted:

"Resolved that the present war with Mexico has its primary origin in the unconstitutional annexation to the United States of the foreign state of Texas, while the same was still at war with Mexico;

that it was unconstitutionally commenced by the order of the President to General Taylor to take military possession of territory in dispute between the United States and Mexico and *in the occupation of Mexico*; and that it is now waged ingloriously—by a powerful nation against a weak neighbour—unnecessarily and without just cause, at immense cost of treasure and life, for the dismemberment of Mexico, and for the conquest of a portion of her territory, from which slavery has already been excluded, with the triple object of extending slavery, of strengthening the ‘Slave Power’ and of obtaining the control of the Free States, under the Constitution of the United States.

“*Resolved* that such a war of conquest, so hateful in its objects, so wanton, unjust, and unconstitutional in its origin and character, must be regarded as a war against freedom, against humanity, against justice, against the Union, against the constitution, and *against the Free States*; and that a regard for the true interests and the highest honour of the country should arouse all good citizens to join in efforts to arrest this gigantic crime by withholding supplies, or other voluntary contributions for its further prosecution, by calling for the withdrawal of our army within the established limits of the United States, and in every way aiding the country to retreat from the disgraceful position of aggression

which it now occupies towards a weak, distracted neighbor and sister republic."

These resolves were debated for several days by the Massachusetts legislature and finally passed two to one, showing a courage which probably no legislature in any state would show under similar circumstances to-day when the spirit of timidity, of "playing safe," and of virulent hostility to such free speech is dominant. This action in the midst of war, was a moral tonic, though the war was fought to a finish, and half of the Mexican territory was taken and paid for at the cost of one Statler Hotel to-day.

The Civil War might have been prevented had our government, like Great Britain in 1833, set free our slaves and compensated the owners. The Mexican War was one great factor in the extension of slavery and the creation of conditions which led to the defiance of the national government in 1860. Civil war belongs in a different category from international war; and our Civil War must be passed over with few words. Revolutions, rebellions, within a nation may continue long after international war has ended; though after general disarmament and prohibition of manufacture of arms for profit, even civil strife would be on a small scale. The civil war in China in 1927 was possible only as China purchased large stores of ammunition sold by gov-

ernments or firms which had accumulations left over from the World War.

In the Civil War voluntary enlistment would not have been adequate either north or south to have carried on the war, and this has been true of all important modern wars, especially the World War. Each section has written its own version of this fratricidal strife, each telling of glorious victories and heroism, but for the most part omitting the crimes committed and the moral loss.

It has been claimed often that with "adequate preparedness" by our government the secessionists would have been overawed and the war prevented. As has previously been said, there never can be adequate preparedness against civil war when both sides have about equal control in the government, and can send half the arms to the region that is disaffected, as was the case under President Buchanan and Cabinet secretaries who presently joined the Confederacy. The southern claim that secession from the Union was as justifiable as that of the thirteen colonies from the mother country failed to recognise that the moral issue in the latter case was one which won a "decent respect" from the "opinion of mankind," while slavery, without which secession would never have come, could make no such appeal.

Before the Civil War many Americans deemed it our "manifest destiny" to annex Cuba and various

filibustering expeditions were sent there. In 1895 the United States prohibited free entrance of cane sugar any longer; this was a great blow to the sugar interests there. The Cubans blamed Spain and became insurgents, and after a humane Governor General had failed to suppress disturbance General Weyler's harsh policy of concentrating inhabitants in certain military camps created great misery and destruction. Our State Department protested and tried to prevent naturalised Cubans from fomenting trouble from here, and giving military assistance. Spain retorted by calling attention to our Sherman's march to the sea and the destruction accompanying his path. Later, in the Philippines, we adopted a similar concentration policy. The chain of Hearst newspapers advocated intervention as American citizens owned \$50,000,000 worth of property in Cuba. Our first claims on Spain for damages were \$16,000,000, but these on investigation by a claims commission, dwindled to \$362,252, in the usual ways that claims diminish. It is interesting to observe here, incidentally, that Hon. Wayne McVeagh showed that the claims awarded the United States for damages against Mexico from 1868 to 1892 were less than one per cent of the claims presented. Great Britain in a certain demand got two per cent of her claims and the United States claims against France were cut down to a "fifty-sixth thousandths

of one per cent." Taking all amounts presented in this survey from different nations, which were \$790,000,000, the total allowance made by an impartial commission was \$8,500,000!

After Spain's withdrawal of General Weyler and grant of autonomy, which would have prevented insurrection if offered earlier, the battleship *Maine* on a "friendly visit" was blown up one night in Havana harbour, killing 250 men. This occurred February 15, 1898, and was followed by the war-cry from sea to sea, "Remember the *Maine*." The cause of the explosion is unknown; the *Maine* was left rusting in Havana harbour for twenty years and we refused to have it raised, to show conclusively whether it was blown up by accident from within or, as was probable, was blown up by rebels to get America's intervention.

Said James Ford Rhodes in his "McKinley and Roosevelt's Administration":

"McKinley feared a rupture in his own party and on account of that fear had not the nerve and power to resist the pressure for war. We may rest assured that if Mark Hanna had been President, there would have been no war with Spain."

When President McKinley went before Congress and asked for \$50,000,000 with which to fight Spain, it was after the representatives of Great

Britain, Germany, France, Austria, Russia, and Italy had appealed to him to continue peaceful relations. It was after he had received from Minister Woodford in Spain the cablegram:

“I believe the ministry are ready to go as far and as fast as they can and still save the dynasty here in Spain. They know that Cuba is lost. Public opinion in Spain has moved steadily toward peace.”

We declared war the day after Woodford's later cablegram had come saying Spain granted the armistice demanded by the President and “I hope that nothing will be done to humiliate Spain, as I am satisfied the present government is going and is loyally ready to go as fast and as far as it can.” The war was the product of a jingo press and shocked and amazed Spain. For this war there was little excuse; aside from indirect loss, it cost \$300,000,000. It ended in our taking the Philippines which, with the exception of Manila, had won independence of Spain by its own efforts. The President insisted that the entire group be taken because of the “commercial opportunity.” The cruelties incident to misgovernment in Cuba could probably have been prevented had the United States secured the co-operation of several of the Latin-American republics in a united protest, followed by a boycott

if the protest failed. No doubt Cuba is far better to-day than she was under Spain, and since the beneficent work under General Leonard Wood in sanitary reform. While the method chosen by the United States accomplished some good, it was unnecessary to accomplish the result and led to far-reaching consequences, including imperialistic policies.

The guerilla war which Filipinos carried on for three years involved enormous losses to them. Our loss was less than 5,000 soldiers. Concentration of natives in camps, the infliction of the torture of the old Spanish "water-cure" to compel natives to disclose where their armed forces were, and other features of our efforts to subdue men who were fighting for their liberty, make sad reading for those who boast of revolutionary ancestors who likewise fought for their own independence.

In Norman Angell's "Patriotism Under Three Flags," the author comments on the habitual language of some of the more popular newspapers, which seemed to indicate a real dementia during the war with Spain, and he quotes by way of illustration from the newspaper with the largest circulation:

"Occasionally we hear croaks from the peace men. 'How sad to kill sons and fathers of sad-eyed women!' they say . . . etc. No sadder than to kill cousins and aunts of sad-eyed rattlesnakes.

The man who would object to this war would object to the destruction of poisonous reptiles in India. And, as for the American who has any feeling about the war other than the red-hot desire to hear of victories and Spanish ships sunk, all we can say is that he reminds us of the cannibal toad now on exhibition in the Paris Jardin d'Acclimatation."

Two out of two hundred signed testimonies by American soldiers, describing scenes similar to those here described:

"1. Last night one of our boys was found shot and his stomach cut open. Immediately orders were received from General Wheaton to burn the town and kill every native in sight,—which was done to a finish. About a thousand men, women, and children were reported to be killed. I am probably growing hard hearted, for I am in my glory when I can sight my gun on some dark skin and pull the trigger. . . . Tell all my enquiring friends that I am doing all I can for Old Glory."

This was signed by A. A. Barnes, Battery G, 3d United States Artillery, and was first published in the *Standard* of Greensburg, Ind.

"2. Our orders (in Samar) were clear and strict. Everybody found in the hills, man, woman and child, was to be killed. Shoot all hogs and dogs, and we were not instructed to spare children . . . I saw as many as twenty Filipinos

given the water cure. The native, of course, resisted, and the soldier rubbed the bottle across the mouth lacerating the flesh and breaking the teeth and leaving the man's face covered with blood. After the cure was over, the prisoner was shot and his body left for the dogs. One night last November we found seven old natives in a shack. The native interpreter plied them with questions, but they refused to tell anything, so we tied them in a row and shot the lot and left them for the dogs . . . I was very sick."

This appeared in the *Philadelphia Record* as the statement from Michael Snee, Company M, Ninth Infantry, under command of John B. Schoeffel, Rochester, New York, April 21, 1902.

Conquest of the Philippines meant doubling of our navy, our direct and indirect expenditure of a thousand million dollars of which only \$3,000,000 in the cholera season was a direct gift. The hospitals, good roads, and schools which followed were paid for by Philippine funds but directed by Americans. Our imperialism began with the conquest of these islands, though according to the Jones Act of 1916, Congress promised independence when a stable government should be established. Up to 1928 no action had been taken toward recognising this pledge or removing our control of the islands from the administration of the War Department.

CHAPTER V

INTERDEPENDENCE

The first step upward from the grunting caveman living on nuts and fruits like chimpanzees, scores of thousands of years ago, to the scholar with an LL.D. came from co-operation with his fellows. Language thus developed and with it man whetted his mind on other minds and learned their experience. The family, the clan, the tribe, the village, the city, the state or province, the nation, were successive stages in a growing and more complex interdependence. Civilisation is another name for interdependence. The most wretched and miserable of men is one who is self-sufficient for all his needs; who must create alone his food, his meagre clothing, and his wigwam. Most wretched spiritually is he whose sympathy is limited to those of his own tribe or sect or social clique. Darwin taught that "selfish and contentious persons will not cohere and without coherence nothing can be effected. The chief causes of the low morality of savages are first, confinement of sympathy to the same tribe." "The Darwinian theory," said William J. Bryan, "represents man as

reaching his present perfection by the operation of the law of hate—the merciless law by which the strong crowd out and kill off the weak”; so little did Mr. Bryan understand Darwin’s phrase “the survival of the fittest,” so often confounded with survival of the best, instead, as it signifies, survival of what is best fitted for a particular environment. If it be an environment of earth, it will be a very low thing, an earthworm that will survive; if it be a low social order, it will be the thug that will survive. “The social instincts,” said Darwin, “with the aid of active intellectual powers and the effects of habit naturally lead to the golden rule: ‘Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them’ and this lies at the foundation of morality. The moral sense is the greatest distinction between man and the lower animals.” This moral sense implies a common nature, common interests, common rights, common duties, a surrender of personal sovereignty for the time in order to have one’s person recognised in a community life which gives back in richness far more than it takes.

A growing sense of interdependence has marked all progress of the human race. The test of a genuinely educated person is not his diplomas, degrees, books written; is it not his capacity to say truthfully with the ancient Latin poet, “I count nothing human foreign to me”? In a stimulating address by

a prince among historical scholars, G. P. Gooch, he says: "The upward movement may be described as symphonic or orchestral. The elements which have created unity in the human race are kinship and language, and one may possibly say religious instinct. But religions have differed so widely and so often created antagonisms that they can not always be counted on as an element for world-unity."

Yet the greatest advance in thought regarding the unity of the human race was the teaching by Christ of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Of whatever race, or sex, or rank, all were equal before a common Father. More or less consciously, for a thousand years the idea of the unity of all people in Christendom, though of different nationalities, grew in western Europe under the headship of the Pope, more powerful than king or emperor. Such a conception of national sovereignty as obtained in Europe in 1914 was unknown in the days of Dante and Wyclif. Christendom transcended the idea of national sovereignty at a time when most of the world was still unknown, but it did not create world-unity. The Renaissance and Reformation broke up even this unity. But no conception of to-day embracing less than humanity as a whole is to be tolerated. Science permits a human voice to be heard half round the globe; and all the instruments of scholarship, commerce, common ideas,

and experiences are unifying human thought and are tuned in the orchestra to the symphony's changing keys.

As long ago as Defoe, the English race was pronounced by him as "mongrel." The earliest element was Iberian, which spread also over France, Spain, and North Africa. Then came the Celtic blood; then the Roman blood, which was a mixture of races from the three continents on the Mediterranean. The Anglo-Saxon infusion was followed by the Danish and Norman. In fewer numbers came the Flemings and French Huguenots. We in America have not only all these through England but many more strains from Germany, Ireland, Italy, Russia, Poland, Greece, Syria, and—more perhaps in our political than racial family—ten million of the sons of Africa. If Britain was of composite race, how much more America.

Language is the greatest invention man ever made, vastly more important than all machines combined. "Man," said Aristotle, "is a symbol-making animal." He creates words which mark the infinite difference between the creature that only inherits barks or squeals and can never create a sign for a universal and the creature who can create a medium for transmission of thought to millions of people through the ages. Not only our blood, but our language is composite. Our short words are usually

Teutonic; the long ones dealing with abstract matters are from the Greek and Latin. Our religion is composite, partly Hebraic, and this, to some extent, developed from other Asiatic peoples than the Hebrews; and partly Greek and Christian. We have borrowed names and usages from Norse Mythology; jurisprudence from Rome; we have learned democracy from Greece. How much do we realise our daily debt to those marvellous minds which rose like snow-capped peaks from the plain of ordinary thought—Plato and Aristotle? After 2,000 years they are still the masters of those who know. Their wisdom, blazing like a huge searchlight across the darkness and materialism of this age of speed and wealth and force, makes our unsteady little lights look pale indeed. "The Greeks," said Mr. Gooch, gave us "ordered freedom" and "introduced into the world the ennobling conception of government by discussion, government by an appeal not to force but to reason." Greece gave the idea of freedom and Rome developed political organisation to a marked extent. To-day self-government has become a matter of course, and the common man, even the Mexican peon, down-trodden for centuries and for many recent years worse off than were our own black slaves, is beginning to lift his head and say, "I too am a man."

In the Middle Ages, in the sight of the Church,

the common man was considered religiously the equal of the feudal lord and knelt at mass beside him; but in the sight of man in daily life he was a serf, a peon, and treated with contempt. It is instructive to note how in the sixteenth century, with the rise of the Puritan spirit, the value of every human being was enhanced and caste among white people diminished. In 1789, the French proclamation of the Rights of Man was simply a new pronouncement of what had been taught in England and America for over a century.

Roman law developed from the custom and experience of many generations of various peoples. The laws and customs of different countries have a common human basis and help standardise social life. The Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, despite their minute logic and acumen, were hampered by ecclesiastical limitations and gained no breadth of philosophic vision. For nearly 1,800 years, between Plato and Saint Thomas Aquinas, there was little independent thought. Then came Descartes, Spinoza and Leibnitz, each of a different nation. Modern philosophy began to flower with them and later reached impregnable heights under the great German idealists.

Scientific genius from many lands has enriched us. Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Linnæus, Newton, Darwin, Pasteur, Roentgen, Edison, and Marconi—

how many lands and tongues these names call to mind! So, too, in literature; Homer, Dante, Cervantes, Goethe, Shakespeare, each writing in a different tongue, belong to the scholars of every land. Music speaks a language which all men can understand. Beauty which is its own excuse for being, wakens kindred emotions in every heart. The whole world was thrilled at the marvellous revelations which archeologists have brought to light of Tut-Ankh-Amen, of Assyrian, Hittite, and Phœnician. The world of scholarship is one. The unlearned layman feels richer as he hears of dinosaur eggs found in Mongolian deserts; of pigmies reached by aeroplane in New Guinea; of all the startling new revelations of the things that reveal stages of development in our mysterious world.

When Austria struck Serbia she hit Alabama. The first week after the war began, cotton went down to half-price, farmers were ruined, factories and mills shut down in Brazil and China. Bread-lines began in New York City. The ends of the earth were touched as by an electric shock. Why? Because a profound revolution has taken place since Washington's day. Washington could travel no faster than could Pharaoh. He would have waited many months to learn of a war broken out in Manchuria. To-day a boy, for two cents, may learn last night's news from Shanghai; his father may

speak with London; he may hear music from Berlin and see a photograph taken yesterday in Paris. Washington lived in a country of less population than our New York City. His wise advice was given for men living under the conditions of his time.

Our enormous influx of news, some worthless, some important, paralyses untrained minds, when it should enrich them. A dazed mind ceases to be astonished or thrilled at the marvellous. As interdependence grows it becomes increasingly important, yet far more difficult, to select out of the stupendous miscellany of facts those which are really salient; to see their bearings on other things, to realise that, though national independence be achieved, we may nevertheless have no liberty in thought expression. The average breadwinner, fed on cheap literature, has little insight into the realities of our kaleidoscopic life in which so little time is taken for reflection. As he faces what are seemingly millions of unrelated facts, he gropes blindly for a clue. The world's greatest need is for interpreters who can discern the essentials, see parts as related to wholes, discount superficial differences, and show how social growth comes only as men come to feel their relations with all things human.

Norman Angell, who, certainly more than any other writer before the World War, reached multitudes in many lands with the philosophy of "The

Great Illusion," has shown the interlocking relationships of commerce, which to-day are a thousandfold more compelling and complex than ever before in history. Not even peace advocates have been alive to this stupendous argument from the recent changes in world conditions, but have dwelt on the unchristian character of war, while often tacitly assuming with their opponents that, if a nation stole, it might gain somewhat of material advantage in spite of wickedness, as indeed, an individual thief may do. This is the great illusion alluded to in an earlier chapter which Mr. Angell's facts and figures set forth. That we, being many, are members one of another is the profound truth to which he revealed a new and startling application:

When the prosperity of an average German factory is distributed pretty evenly over some such factors as these: the capacity of a peasant in Provence who sells his olives in New York to subscribe to a South American loan, in order that a dock might be built on the Amazon to enable the manufacturer in Manchester to sell furniture in Baku to a merchant whose wealth is due to the development of petrol consumption in an automobile trade created in Paris—in a world where business is done in such conditions as these, we are told that the limits of commercial or industrial activity are determined by the limits of political influence, and that there exists some direct relation

between political power and economic advantage! And we are still told it even when the prosperity of lesser states give it the lie; the whole thing is one vast mystification, the most colossal illusion of the modern world.

It is the function of banking to destroy the false philosophy which assumes that bygone conditions still survive, and that any nation has aught to gain in the end by attacking another, even if it wins. A great navy does not increase the carrying trade of a country. Little Norway has had, in proportion to population, three times the carrying trade of England. Switzerland gets orders from Canada which England can not get with all her dreadnaughts. Before the war Germany had a larger gold reserve than England, which did not prevent Germany borrowing to a great extent from England, and the latter from being the banker of the world. Even before the war, little Belgium's Three-per-cents were quoted at 96, while imperial Germany's were quoted at 82. The Three-and-a-half-per-cents of mighty Russia were at 81 while Norway, practically without an army, had hers at 102. These facts are economic-sociological phenomena. Capitalists have evidently concluded that nations that have great armies and navies are not as safe places for investments as are little nations which are not likely to go to war. In 1870 Bismarck could afford to fight the

France of that day. In 1914, though with a far greater army and with twenty million more people, it became a different problem, when these added millions were dependent on foreign food and living on industries dependent in large measure on foreign capital. The preposterous Pan-German's economics were borrowed from the era of the robber-baron. Had he ruined conquered victims, he would have had to rehabilitate them in order to feed and clothe his own people. The traditional axioms of European statecraft were largely based on robber-baron economics. Statesmen imagined that nations could expand by force of arms. Italy has learned no lesson from France in Africa; and France, though she can command black soldiers, has not yet perceived how unreal are most of her colonial gains, except upon the map. What French family that must send its young son to spend a year or more in the army, and must pay the cost of the increased colonial administration upkeep, is the richer for this larger space upon the map? The dictum of a leading English journal before the war that "If Germany were extinguished to-morrow, the day after to-morrow there is not an Englishman in the world who would not be richer," was equalled by that of a Boston business man after the war, "I would just as lief have the whole German race wiped out." This talk by educated people shows such an abysmal depth of ignorance of ele-

mentary economics, and the ultimate effect upon themselves, that one doubts whether what is commonly called "education" is any assurance that one has got beyond the stage of belief in witchcraft and astrology and slavery. The first glimmerings of intelligence have seemed to come to many astute business men since the war regarding the need of having prosperous customers if one is to sell goods. The bungling over the problem of German reparations was largely due to obtuseness in this matter. It was a new idea to some people that *exports alone can pay for reparations, and they must exceed imports*. The report of the Institute of Economics, established by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, with headquarters in Washington, demonstrated that "Germany cannot feed more than sixty per cent of her people unless she can continue to pay for her present import of foodstuffs; about one-sixth of her agricultural lands were taken from her at the close of the war. Food and raw materials must be a first charge on foreign money obtained by the sales of exports; only the money left over after these are paid can be devoted to reparations. The Allies can not eat their cake and have it too. They can not collect anything from Germany so long as they refuse to let Germany earn by foreign trade money acceptable to them. . . . The total production of gold in the world since the discovery of America is

little more than half the sum which Germany is obligated to pay." This was written before the Dawes agreement had brought sanity into the solution of the problem and at a time when Germany was harshly criticised for building canals, factories, and public buildings, as if this diverted money from reparations. But she used home material, paid in paper money, worthless elsewhere, and none of this product could be exported.

Professor Moon of Columbia University in his "Imperialism and World Politics" gives a searching analysis of economic relations between nations, and shows convincingly through charts and figures that the assets of imperialism are not equal to its liabilities. No doubt individual investors and those who deal in steel and cotton often make large profits, but the masses are compelled to pay more taxes to keep up colonial armies and navies than they receive in duty-free goods from their colonies. England has possessions in every quarter of the globe, yet she must obtain from outside regions copper, quicksilver, platinum, cotton, fertilisers, and sulphur, as her possessions do not adequately supply her. "What is needed to-day," says Professor Moon, "is the gradual development through international conference of international agreements against unfair practice in the control of raw materials."

Some treatment of the world as an organic whole

must result from economic processes. World federation is a clear corollary of the demands of science, invention, and modern civilisation. Feudalism had to merge internationalism as an economic necessity. The economic need has forced the world to face the problem of interdependence from a new angle. The World Economic Conference held in Geneva in May, 1927, brought forward in its resolutions the economic truth as it exists to-day. Co-operation in commerce, industry, agriculture was the demand of 350 delegates. Lowering of tariff barriers, abolition of import and export prohibitions, the application of science to agriculture, will point the way to economic unity and consequent peace.

The portentous problem of the increase of population and how to meet it by adequate food supply, is forcing economists to consider how Germany can get necessary raw materials for her manufactures when deprived of her African colonies and with one-third of her population requiring food from outside sources. They propose the sending of German scientists to this huge continent, four times the size of the United States and rich in mineral and many other products. For the 400,000 babies of Italy, who annually increase its numbers, some room must be found, and Africa offers apparently the best solution for that and for other economic problems. If properly developed with far-sighted co-

operative effort, Africa may help prevent for hundreds of years economic disaster to all branches of the white race and at the same time uplift the un-inventive backward peoples who are unable to develop their natural resources by themselves.

Our modern political economy, dealing with human needs, raw materials, interchange, migration, with the reflex action of man's endeavours to grasp wealth without commensurate giving in return are awakening a profound new sense of interdependence. The growing spirit of service, unknown to the men of the classic age, who had slight perception of the unity of the human race, is finding its exponents in every land. The forerunners of the idea of the League of Nations belonged with the men of vision who are to-day making segregated, narrow, and prejudiced men objects of pity and derision to sane and healthy minds. The Darwinian perception of the scientific as well as moral value of the golden rule reveals the key to progress in an increasingly complex and interdependent world.

It is commonly assumed that morality and self-interest are antagonistic both in the case of citizens and of nations. The assumption is that a moral action involves some self-sacrifice. Lord Hugh Cecil thus states the doctrine in its international form:

INTERDEPENDENCE

“We personify a state, but a state is not a person. It contains a vast number of persons, and those who speak in its name and determine its policies act not for themselves but for others. Everything which falls under the head of unselfishness, is inappropriate to the action of a state. No one has a right to be unselfish with other people’s interests. It is the business of every ruler to exact to the utmost every claim which can be both justly and wisely made on behalf of his country. He is in the position of a trustee of the interests of others and must be just and not generous.”

The qualification “justly and wisely” however goes a very long way when it becomes the case of *noblesse oblige* in the relations of a strong to a weak nation. Never was a nation wiser than ours when it returned the Boxer indemnity to China and in having it expended in sending her sons here to learn our western science. When President Wilson declared that the United States would “never again take a foot of land by conquest,” he recognised the iniquity of the principle of conquest, and that it is the duty of the nation as much as of the individual to be just. The nation must no more lie or steal than the citizen himself, and for the same reason. In the long run, and often in a very short run, theft and violence are their own undoing. When Bismarck, though against his own better judgment, was

over-persuaded to take Alsace-Lorraine to promote future security to the empire, it was under the assumption that the golden rule could play no part in that transaction. But did it prove of advantage to the state? This act led to France allying herself with Russia, to forty years of bitterness, the turning of Europe into an armed camp at incredible sacrifice, and finally to the return of the provinces to France. But for that the World War would have been a Balkan war.

In 1878, when Lord Beaconsfield went to Berlin to attend the Congress of diplomats, he persuaded them to tear up the treaty of San Stefano, which had guarded the Balkan states according to a true ethnical principle, and it forced these little nationalities back under Turkish control. He wanted a strong Turkey to hold the Dardanelles and to prevent Russia from getting an outlet there and threatening the Suez Canal and British trade with India. This policy was one of the deep-lying causes of the cataclysm of 1914. Beaconsfield's policy was that Great Britain's duty was to ignore the golden rule and think solely of her own interests. But her own interests could not be conserved unless she dealt "wisely and justly." The massacres and cruelty at the hands of the Turks which followed the Berlin treaty led to the first and second Balkan wars and to the World War, originating

in that seething and embittered section of Europe which had been the pawn of the great powers. Tens of thousands of the fine youth of Great Britain lay down their lives in the awful butchery at Gallipoli, and billions of dollars were poured out to open the Dardanelles to Russia after Great Britain ever since the Crimean War had done her utmost to keep Russia from having a warm water port.

Many religious souls like Tolstoi have held that "reason has nothing to do with loving my neighbour." In religion and intuition alone did he find sanction for this love. The modern scientific mind often looks with some contempt on idealists as impractical, holding beautiful theories that will not work because opposed to reason. This conception as regards moralists results from inability to perceive that mutual aid and interdependence increase the life force of the individual. He gains by giving; yet this principle, like many another in social science, has not been demonstrated to many minds that readily see cause and effect in chemistry and physics. If morality and self-interest do not harmonise, then moral conduct must work harm instead of benefit, and if such moral actions were continued one would end in the poor-house or asylum or the grave! *Ergo*, if every one were moral, all would work out their own loss and destruction! Morality, therefore would weaken life instead of making it

more abundant. The root of the matter is failure to see that life is enormously enriched by association and that the welfare of society requires the highest well-being of the citizen. He must share in the increased vital intensity of the whole.

If murder and theft were really for the well-being of the murderer and thief, they would be justified. But obviously, if this principle were practised universally, the thief and murderer themselves would be robbed and assaulted and not only civilisation but all life would end. "Thou shalt not kill" was a law written on the fleshly table of men's hearts long before they were engraved on tables of stone, and this was because it promoted self-interest. In like manner, shiftless work and laziness are immoral because they do not produce what men must have; if they did, they would be justified. Chastity and temperance lengthen life and make it nobler and more effective; that fact, and not the pronouncements of an oracle, compels their observance. Envy is unrighteous and emulation is not, because the first makes one unhappy, and the second incites happy, healthful activity. Darwin has shown that morality evolves from the consideration of self-interest as manifested in association:

"Even at an early period in the history of man, the expressed wishes of the community will have naturally influenced to a large extent the conduct

of each member; and as all wish happiness, the 'greatest happiness principle' will have become a most important secondary guide and object; the social instinct, however, together with sympathy, having served as the primary impulse and guide."

Life is another name for association and life more abundant is measured according to the fulness with which one life shares and enjoys the experience of another, enriching others and being enriched through interdependence and co-operation. Divorces, ruptures, tariff barriers, wars, break natural association and communication. They are immoral in so far as they deplete fulness of life and happiness for all concerned.

The modern scientific mind which has discarded the old basis of authority as to morals, if it has found no substitute is drifting like a derelict at sea. The post-war scepticism among youth as to whether age-long conventional morality has any scientific basis is one of the tragic manifestations of the confused thought of the time which, if continued, may bring about another world catastrophe. There is a true touchstone, a scientific test that shows indubitably what is right for individuals and for nations; it is whether the act, universally exercised, will in the long run promote richer, larger life. There is no contradiction between morality and self-interest, only a contradiction between truth and error. Our

scientific age must restate in scientific form what religion and instinct foresaw, and prove that the highest self-interest of the individual and the state is in harmony with biological and social evolution. World righteousness and world economic welfare must be shown to be compatible.

Social problems find solution in justice, not charity. George W. Nasmyth has illustrated this idea by showing that when the former Sultan of Turkey levied thirty per cent taxes on 24,000,000 people he received less revenue than did the Queen of Holland with 6,000,000 subjects and a lower tax-rate. Over-taxed people are under-fed; subjects of a despot are ignorant. For both reasons the Turks produced little. Injustice reacts on those who practise it, and that is the prime reason for condemning it. If all were unjust life would suffer paralysis. States that had slave-labour fell farther behind in productivity than those that had free labour.

Conscience has been happily called "a lightening calculator of enlightened self-interest." History is an account of the growth of comradeship in ever wider and wider circles. The people of Illinois and Indiana know that it is not for their own interest to despoil each other. Some day the Balkan states, after they have acquired a Geneva method of conference, and an easy auxiliary language as a medium of communication, and have dropped tariff barriers,

will each see likewise that the other's prosperity enhances theirs. Justice is another name for equality before the law. Injustice and war act as a negative selection and weaken or destroy the flower of the race. Rome fell, not from luxury, but from the weeding out generation after generation of the ablest men, leaving weaklings and slaves to propagate posterity.

Science is rapidly multiplying wealth, so that the estimate made by de Bloch that the average income per day of each human being was about ten cents, would probably be exceeded to-day, despite the war's devastation. He estimated that with world federation and a world customs union this income would be multiplied tenfold. World federation becomes the solvent for all social reform. Welfare workers, whether in the field of education, medicine, or industry, are finding themselves working on the same problem of world welfare which will be enormously simplified when the fabulous sums of money put into attempted preservation of peace through increasing armaments shall be set free by universal treaties based on an understanding of co-operation. To learn this we must create the international mind.

CHAPTER VI

CREATING THE INTERNATIONAL MIND

There are hundreds of international organisations in this world for which the radio and phone-film are annihilating time and space and making the huge globe shrink smaller and smaller every day. Of these, the International Postal Union with its headquarters at Berne, the International Institute of Agriculture, with its headquarters at Rome, and now over twenty years old, and The World Federation of Education Associations, now over four years old, deal with some of the most fundamental international relations. Every one of these three originated in the thought of an American. Mr. Blair, head of the American Postal Union, first suggested the idea in 1862 of an International Postal Union, out of which came a dozen years later the definite organisation with headquarters at Berne. To David Lubin of Sacramento is due the credit of the conception of the International Institute of Agriculture, and largely its successful accomplishment in linking fifty-seven nations together in a common purpose before the League of Nations was conceived. The World Federation of Education Associations was the

outcome of the committee on Foreign Relations appointed in 1921 by the National Education Association. This began almost at once to organise a world conference on Education. In 1913 this Association had arranged an international congress on education which was held in 1915 at the beautiful Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco. In 1914, following a resolution passed by Congress, the President of the United States sent invitations to all foreign governments credited to the United States to send delegates to this Congress, and thirty nations officially did so. This conference, which came after the World War had been raging for a year, felt deep responsibility in laying foundations for a new world order. There had been earlier international congresses on education held in this country, one in connection with the World Fair of 1893. The most extensive work in creating international good will and understanding was that by the American School Citizenship League with headquarters in Boston. The National Education Association endorsed the work of the League and said it hoped that School Peace Leagues might be established in every country. At the suggestion of our national commissioner of education the Netherlands Government sent out an invitation for a conference to be held in September, 1914. Sixteen nations, including all the great nations except Ger-

many, accepted, but alas, before the date arrived, educators and every one else were thinking of bombs and machine guns and the world was in a ferment.

For many years before and since the World War, May 18th, the anniversary of the opening of the first Hague Conference, was celebrated as Peace Day. Then followed a short period of great uncertainty as to the future plans for world adjustment, when this celebration fell into abeyance and emphasis was laid on Armistice Day. But in 1923 the World Conference on Education, meeting in San Francisco, selected the day for general celebration, calling it Good Will Day and affirming that on this day, May 18th, "should instruction be given concerning the results of the Hague Conferences and also the later efforts to bring the world together into a co-operative body, and that this instruction should be accompanied by songs, national and international, plays and pageants which carry out the spirit of the day." The interchange of messages between school children of different nations is becoming a feature of the observance of May 18th. The children of Wales have for six years sent by wireless a goodwill message. What could be more delightful than this:

"We boys and girls of the principality of Wales and Monmouthshire, greet with a cheer the boys and girls of every other country under the sun.

Will you, millions of you, join in our prayer that God will bless the efforts of the good men and women of every race and people who are doing their best to settle the old quarrels without fighting? Then there will be no need for any of us as we grow older, to show our pride for our country by going out to hate and to kill one another. Long live the League of Nations—the friend of every mother, the protector of every home, and the guardian angel of the youth of the world.”

Every High School class in our whole country would do well to formulate a friendly letter to be sent to the children of some foreign city, the pupil whose message was judged the best to choose the city to which it were to be sent for publication through its School Board. These messages could be made part of the work in English and would serve incidentally to develop imagination and good-will, a by-product of supreme value. Every year Tokyo, Melbourne, Budapest, Leipsic, Glasgow, Buenos Aires, and scores of other cities should thus be made to feel that the children of Chicago, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Boston and scores of our own cities were thinking of them and looking forward to a time when they should do better than their fathers and bring about a co-operative world.

At the San Francisco meeting, which was attended by representatives of fifty nations, the World Federation of Education Associations had its birth,

and subsequently a prize of \$25,000 was offered by Raphael Herman of Detroit for the best programme for it to undertake. At its first biennial, at Edinburgh in 1925, the programme adopted was presented by Dr. David Starr Jordan, the eminent educator and peace advocate, who was the prize winner. His suggestions briefly stated were: for committees on teaching of history and patriotism "expressing its values, its limitations, and its perversions"; on international sports, especially those games which involve co-operative action; effort to establish a Bureau of Conciliation in the Department of State at Washington; on consideration of military preparedness and military training in schools and colleges, and on standing incentives to war; on current arguments on war as a cosmic necessity; on the International Court of Justice and the general machinery for international co-operation. The elaboration of this last idea encouraged the thought of our entrance into the League of Nations with a modification of present provisions for sanctions. The establishment of these committees and the future approval of later meetings of their recommendations will require years of constant work, which could be enormously fruitful if adequate funds were available to enable educational experts to devote their whole time to this great work.

Meanwhile, certain considerations in harmony with Dr. Jordan's point of view might well be considered and adopted as widely as possible. One of the most hopeful is that the governments of eight great nations could create and keep world peace. This does not depend on the conversion or education of illiterates, who form the bulk of the world's population. World peace, which can arrive without any change in human nature, depends on true ideas on international rights and duties, and the will to attain them in making substitutes for war obligatory. World peace could probably be accomplished by the cost of one single cruiser wisely spent. The reason that the large funds given for the cause have not yet produced the results expected is partly due to the fact that they have been spent largely in academic or ill-co-ordinated work, rather than in practical ways to affect legislatures and executives as well as the general public. This is not to underestimate the very valuable work that has already undermined much cheap philosophy about war.

The foundation of peace teaching is in the home. School authorities for two generations to come must consider educating parents as well as teachers and pupils. Parent-Teacher Associations should bring together all who are working for children. Should not the general scheme of studies on rights and duties be made clear to parents, especially as regards

the futility of war, substitutes for war, and the refutation of current fallacies about it? Should not parents be shown how the first principles of the fair settlement of disputes must begin in the nursery, and be given in the pre-school age? The advantage of a "cooling-off period" should be stressed. If boys of ten and twelve fight, this "cooling-off time" might be used for a written statement from each fighter of what he thinks the other thinks about the affair. The writing out of this would be considerable education to a turbulent, resentful youngster. It would force him to take the other's point of view, which lays the basic principle for world-peace. The enormous value of a period of investigation and delay before action in the case of nations can be shown as illustrated in the Dogger-bank affair during the Russo-Japanese War, which is a dramatic and didactic story. The same cooling-off period is now provided for in many international treaties.

"Seven out of ten children and young people in America under twenty-five years of age are unreached by the educational programme of any church, Jewish, Protestant, or Catholic" is the estimate obtained after careful investigation. Each nation represented in the World Federation of Education Associations might well ascertain its own proportion of youth thus neglected. Many college graduates are devoid of any serious thought of God

or of what Kant calls "the categorical imperative." A sense of duty is often diluted to a mere conformity to conventionality and good taste. There can be no foundation for the international mind and the brotherhood of man but the Fatherhood of God. An eminent university president has recently said: "The forces that make for human degeneracy were never so many, so active, or so ominous, and nothing less than civilisation is at stake. Childhood and youth need religion more than anything else, and more than at any other time of life, for the foundation of character; education without it lacks heart and soul. For this stage of life, almost any faith or creed is better than none. Our statesmen need new training in international relations, for they show every symptom which alienists find in all minds grappling with problems too large for their powers. We have lost power of discrimination between men, things, ideas, and books." Civilisation has reached the stage when an earnest alarm-call is issued by a British officer addressing the Royal Institute of Public Health: "Instruction against gas should occupy a definite place in school curriculum. Anti-gas drills should be carried on periodically." When Mr. Edison tells us that London can now be destroyed in three hours, eight millions turned to corpses and their homes to ashes, by recently invented methods of destruction, the futility of rifle practice, even if

made universal, seems evident. The public needs to be profoundly impressed with the fact that war preparations must lessen and soon end altogether, or the suicide of white civilisation will be threatened. Can not a fresh emphasis be put on this in all Normal School instruction?

One of the chief obstacles to the creation of the international mind is the persistent effort of The War Department, of various "patriotic" societies, and the jingo press to put military training into schools, and to encourage all youth to go to military camps. Military training is being extended in an unprecedented degree. In 1862 Congress passed the Morrill Land Grant Act, which gave land to agricultural colleges and provided that among other things military training should be offered. This amounted to little but military physical drill for a time; but, in 1916, a great "preparedness" drive swept the country with appeals for increase in defence. Universal military training was proposed. The agency for this was the National Defense Act, which in 1920 was amended and enlarged, and was the basis for wide-spread effort to extend military education in the schools. It was astonishing to see civil educational institutions relinquishing part of their control over teaching to the War Department. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps is divided into Junior and Senior divisions, the first giving instruc-

tion in high and preparatory schools, the second in colleges and military schools. The first course in college is for two years; two years more may be elected with the requirement that it shall include a summer in camp and not be broken before the expiration of the four years. In 1925 military training was given in more than 226 educational institutions, by members of the R. O. T. C., while other trainers gave instruction in some other schools. Substantial financial help is offered students who take the advanced course in college, this amounting sometimes to \$300 a year and providing a strong inducement to impecunious students. General Pershing expressed fervent hope that there might come "plans and policies which might be applied to our schools everywhere" and that the summer camps should have presently the training of 100,000 young men every summer. For years it was assumed that agricultural colleges with state subsidies were not only to offer military training but to require it; this has now been repudiated by government authority, and therefore when it is required it is at the desire of the trustees or faculty.

There are two aspects to this training, one the physical, the other the psychological. Even Germany did not give military training before the nineteenth year, simply preparing students for it by physical training previously. Dudley A. Sargent,

M.D., long at the head of the Gymnasium at Harvard University, after technical discussion of the muscles and nerves employed in proper exercise wrote:

“The exercises of the young should be of such a composite nature as to bring about the co-operation and co-ordination of the muscles. This involves principally the training of the central nerve system. All gymnastic sports and athletic games that require skill, dexterity, coolness, courage, and presence of mind are included in this list and are exceedingly valuable as adjuncts in the development of character.

“My principal objection to military drill as a physical exercise is that it does not to any extent meet the physiological demands of the body as set forth in the above observations. In other words: it is not of sufficient interest as a means of physical development to arouse any moral earnestness on the part of the boys. The exercises of the manual are not performed with sufficient force and rapidity to engage the energetic contraction of the muscles employed. It is an essentially one-sided exercise, bringing into excessive exercise . . . while the other muscles, excepting the legs on parade days, do not get sufficient employment to keep them in good condition. It does not increase the respiration and quicken the circulation to a sufficient extent to secure the constitutional benefits that should accrue from exercise. The muscles are not alternately contracted

and relaxed, but are kept in a state of prolonged tension. This not only impairs the tone of the muscles but puts an additional strain on the brain and nervous system . . . there is nothing in the drill itself that tends to make one erect or graceful. If you would account for the graceful poise of the West Point cadets, you must see them in summer two hours a day in the hands of the dancing master. . . . In case of any malformation or local weakness the drill tends to increase the defects rather than to relieve them."

What the growing boy needs is not routine drill but boy-scouting, competitive games, everything that develops initiative, ingenuity, courage. Whatever may be said for military training in college, it is premature before that, beyond marching and the setting-up drill which is only a part of ordinary gymnastic training. All this should be supplied for factory hands and clerks as well as for students. General Leonard Wood has said that: "Personally I do not believe that we should give the training until the year in which the youth becomes nineteen." Colonel Thomas F. Edmands has said: "The modern drill regulations are by no means adapted for work in schools under any circumstances."

But the main objection felt by those who would inculcate the international mind is that the use of guns, target shooting at "a target which wiggles" and all the accompaniments of the military drill pro-

duce a profound psychological impression on young minds, as they are intended to do. Much is said in the way of inducement as to the instruction in citizenship given in military camps. Analysis of the War Department's plan for division of time shows that in R. O. T. C. camps five hours are given the first year and three the second and that ends it; while 90, 104, 126, and 148 hours respectively are given in the four years to military training and instruction. In a manual which stated that it was a "Military Bible," issued in 1923 and written by two United States army officers, we find that it had been adopted by 105 military schools and colleges, and gave specific instructions as to the best way in which to place an enemy's feet and shoulders when one was trying to break his neck; how to use the bayonet in different parts of the body, and how to "kick the most vulnerable parts." The manual says:

"It is an easy matter to teach the few simple technical details of bayonet combat, but an instructor's success will be measured by his ability to instil into his men the will and desire to use the bayonet . . . It is the intense eagerness to fight and kill hand to hand, and is the overwhelming impulse behind every successful bayonet assault . . . the growth of the spirit of the bayonet is fostered in short talks on what has already been accomplished by the bayonet. There is no sentiment about the use of the bayonet. It is a cold-

blooded proposition. The bayonet fighter kills or is killed. The instructor must encourage the men to cultivate a facial expression of sternness, eagerness to fight, and confidence in winning . . . To finish an opponent who hangs on or attempts to pull you to the ground, always try to break his hold by driving the knees or foot to his crotch and gouging his eyes with your thumbs."

The outcry against this manual was so great after a time that in some instances it has been withdrawn or modified. But the animus that actuated the above statements still remains. When untrained, credulous youth are subjected to training by officers who are under the obsession of the fallacies presented in a later chapter, especially when they are able and attractive men, the psychological result is certain. It is this attitude of mind that, regardless of the gift of uniform and railroad fare and a free vacation in healthful surroundings, fills the minds of parents with misgiving. True, the sons may return home with no desire for war; but will they not feel that war is inevitable, and that military service will give more glory and honour than any service for producing health, or for life and property-saving, which can be done by a non-uniformed civilian, and which will bring no medals, title, pensions, or adventure? That protests to the War Department are not unavailing is shown by the fact that in the 1926

edition of the *R. O. T. C. Manual*, Second Year Advanced Course, the following passages that appeared in 1925 have been deleted, as a matter of policy, but presumably with no change of mind on the part of the writers:

“In this world of ours, force is the ultimate power. The mainsprings of human action are self-preservation and self-interest, in a word, selfishness.” “We may ponder whether if selfishness, ambition, competition and strife were removed from the world, we should not fall into a most intolerable state of stagnation.” “An armistice should never be granted at the instance of a defeated foe; it is the enemy’s admission of his own weakness and the signal for administering the knock-out punch.” “During the course of a great war, every government, whatever its previous form, should become a despotism.”

The argument for military training has been stated by Major Wm. W. Edwards: “The High School boy in his Sophomore year is in his most plastic and enthusiastic age. He is at the age of hero worship and idealism—once fairly launched on enthusiasm for the R. O. T. C., he will almost certainly continue it either at college or elsewhere. The Junior R. O. T. C. is the fountain head of military training and when he is fourteen . . . is just the right age.”

CREATING THE INTERNATIONAL MIND

The War Department has steadily gained in its endeavours; it has had about \$4,000,000 to spend in a year in R. O. T. C. expenses, and the economic allurements which it offers are impressive. But there is a rising tide of hostility to compulsory training and it is to be hoped that many more colleges will follow the example of Wisconsin University, Boston University School of Business Administration, and some other institutions which are making military drill optional. How can the international mind be created in the atmosphere of the R. O. T. C., when no substitutes for war are ever discussed and it is assumed that war will never end until human nature ends?

Among the hopeful agencies for peace is the new international auxiliary language now coming into vogue.

"The war is only an episode; communication marks an epoch," said Professor G. F. Nicolai in his "Biology of War," written during the World War, probably one of the most important books on war ever written.

Communication began when man "the symbol-making animal," developed language and made of sound a universal. After unknown ages came hieroglyphics, then the alphabet, and finally "Gutenberg made thought cosmopolite." To-day the telephone and radio are annihilating space and time,

and the American Radio Relay League is considering an international language as becoming almost a necessity for their business. They have written officers of foreign radio clubs asking their approval for the use of amateurs of Esperanto or Ido.

Henry Ford was quoted as saying: "Difference in language indicates difference in thought, in ambition, and method. Difference in language hinders science and invention and commerce just as it hinders world peace and understanding. Language leaves its mark on everything, and you can readily see it in government and mechanics. There are some languages in which you cannot build a machine at all. There are some languages in which you cannot successfully run a factory."

If the peoples of the world are to live in friendly co-operation, it is imperative that they should understand each other. Photographs and cinemas may help visualise certain phases of each other's lives. But we need something more, for films in the Orient have often presented the worst and most licentious features of American life, outlawed here and belying us abroad. The profiteer in films has poisoned the minds of millions of Asiatics, and laid the foundation for contempt and emotions akin to hate.

Hundreds of millions of Orientals, with minds as keen as ours, are shut off by illiteracy in their own language from understanding even their own peo-

ple, for lack of an alphabetic system of notation. Not one in a thousand of them will learn a European language and come into touch with world thought. Unless there can be some very simple, easy means of communication devised, one which is international in all its connotations and will create no prejudice, there seems no possibility of that real understanding which undermines the danger of war. A Danish or Portuguese discoverer or inventor wants to get into immediate touch with the mind of Petrograd, Vienna, Rome, Melbourne, Tokyo, Buenos Aires, and New York. It is costly to translate books even into a dozen different languages, yet he must reach the users of one hundred and fifty different languages and dialects if his product of genius shall benefit the world. No living language is simple and regular enough and sufficiently without idioms to be adopted as the international language to supplement native dialects. English grammar and genders are simple, but our irrational spelling and idioms and ambiguities in pronouns make English far more difficult than any simple international language which can be employed. Such a language should be phonetic, should contain only those sounds which are common to all European languages, and the whole question of spelling and pronunciation should be disposed of by a grammar school child in fifteen minutes, instead of needing attention more

or less for ten years. Most busy breadwinners have no time to learn more than one language aside from their own, and this ought to put them into touch with all the world.

All the little nations like Holland, Albania, and Greece, which so jealously guard their own historic language, and must teach their children several alien tongues if they would be educated, would feel immediate relief if in one-quarter of the time needed to acquire one European language they could come into touch with all the world. Repugnance which thoughtless people have for an auxiliary language because it is "artificial," is like that of a sentimentalist who objects to railroads because their tracks are not as beautiful as meandering wood-paths. Most accessories and instruments in civilised life are as artificial as shoes and stoves and pen and ink. The only question is, are they beneficent? Does Esperanto, or Ido, or some improvement on them, promise to save for hundreds of millions of people a year's time? Does it in actual practice help to break down that nationalistic prejudice which the World War has so accentuated?

Just what form the new auxiliary language should take only linguistic experts can decide. It should be based on European roots, preferably on Latin roots, familiar to persons of culture, and which will aid the pupil who wishes to go further and acquire

European languages. When psychologic experiments have developed the absolutely easiest form of language—the shortest cut in conveying information—the public must be educated as to the scientific and missionary value of the spread of the new invention. It seems as tremendous in its possibilities as the railroad or radio have been. The reviving interest in the matter is shown by the increase of Esperanto journals from twenty or thirty at the close of the World War to about seventy now. After eighteen sittings at the College de France, Esperanto with certain modifications was favoured by the savants as the most desirable. It is a language, which like any living language, can grow.

To establish the wide-spread study of the auxiliary language, normal classes authorised by governments and preferably sponsored by the League of Nations should prepare to teach the secondary schools of the world. Thus all business clerks, bankers, librarians, commercial agents, journalists, world travellers, and delegates to international congresses would in one school generation acquire facility and these would be the persons who would control the avenues of influence which govern policies and legislation.

The spirit of cosmopolitanism, which in the days of Kant and Goethe prevailed, in spite of much narrowness, would return and enlarge the scope of

patriotism from nation to humanity. A commonly used international language would profoundly aid the sense of human solidarity. It would follow or accompany a common coinage and common standards of weights and measures. In the course of a century it might save a year or so of study or wasted effort for untold millions of human beings.

In 1924 there assembled in Venice, in response to an invitation from an Italian Chamber of Commerce, representatives of 208 organisations from 23 different countries, including representatives from 84 chambers of commerce in Europe, from two in America, and from others in Asia and Africa. The conference was arranged by commercial bodies favouring Esperanto as a means of international communication, though representatives from societies not favouring Esperanto were admitted. It was learned that China had introduced the teaching of this language into normal schools because of the difficulty of European languages. A remarkable case of conversion was that of an Italian professor who had come as a sceptic and simply meant to observe. On the train he learned the grammar of Esperanto, which contains only sixteen rules. He actually took part in the proceedings, speaking very slowly but correctly in Esperanto. It was reported from Bulgaria that many Bulgarian merchants preferred to correspond in Esperanto, and that more of

them knew that language than French or English.

The Paris Chamber of Commerce favoured Esperanto and were influenced by the fact that Esperanto possesses only twelve verb endings while most national languages have 180 and, as they usually have 100 irregular verbs, one may need to learn thousands of terminations. To show that Esperanto may express exact shades of language, experiments were made of translations from three widely different and delicate texts; two Esperantists made the translations under the eyes of the judges; later, two others, ignorant of the original text, made the second translation immediately afterwards to the original text. The closeness of the last translation to the original convinced sceptics.

Every child should be encouraged to look forward to an auxiliary language as twenty years ago they looked forward to the development of aviation. Educational authorities throughout the world should work in close co-operation with commercial, technical, scientific, religious, and other groups to secure serious study of the world language, and should acquaint themselves with the status of the work and what has been done by the Committee on International Auxiliary Language at Washington. The fact that a quarter of a million Esperantists exist, and that people of over twenty nations assemble at congresses to practise language and get acquainted,

is evidence of the practicality of the invention which in some form is destined to help make the doctrine of the brotherhood of man become a reality.

Physical science and material development have in a sense brought the antipodes together, but they have not gone far to develop sympathy and understanding and a sense of unity. The world needs something more than mechanical devices. It needs a different international philosophy, a different point of view, a new communication of minds and spirits. It ought not to be a generation before the radio messages from London and New York should be understood simultaneously by High School students in twenty different countries, and when the increasing number of delegates to world conferences should listen to all addresses translated into one auxiliary language instead of sitting through the wearisome process of listening to the same thing in three or four languages. Enormous sums are being given almost daily for educational work along the old conventional lines, and that is well. But why does not some millionaire with imagination endow the League's Commission on Intellectual Co-operation for research and experiment necessary to perfect one of the world's greatest instrumentalities for human progress?

CHAPTER VII

DANGEROUS FALLACIES ABOUT WAR AND PEACE

War is chiefly the product of false premises, twisted logic, of outgrown slogans, of euphemisms which throw a glamor over evil. As men think, madness and misery, or justice and prosperity, ensue. The primary fallacy is that the man who understands the science and technique of war necessarily understands the philosophy of war, the available substitutes for war, the way in which alien people react, and the obligation of international relationships.

Calm and frank debate with experts on T. N. T., on submarines, armour plate, and poison gas, is made difficult at the start by the assumption on the part of so many experts on the technique of war that any one who argues concerning the futility of force under modern conditions asperses Washington, Grant, and Pershing and is a crack-brained theorist. Nevertheless a calm and frank statement should be attempted. Not only do the technical experts create public opinion, but many who sincerely pin their faith to them are vociferous.

Said Renan: "War is, in a way, one of the conditions of progress, the cut of the whip which prevents a country from going to sleep."

Said von Moltke: "War is an element of the order of the world, established by God."

Said Lester F. Ward: "War has been the chief and leading condition of human progress."

Said Major Charles F. Farnsworth, U. S. A.: "In every animal there exists a fighting instinct. If you crush that fighting instinct in a man or boy, you get the coward."

Said Major-General Charles F. Summerall; reported on Jan. 17, 1925: "Our country is better to-day, infinitely better, than it would have been had there not been a great war. The spirit of service is abroad in the land, and our country is profiting by it."

"By war alone can we acquire those virile qualities necessary to win in the stern strife of actual life." An endless number of illustrations of this same fallacy as to the nature of war uttered by eminent men, largely in the army and navy, could be presented.

What is the fallacy? It is the confounding of that kind of struggle which Nature ordained with that struggle which sets at defiance man's instincts and Nature's teachings. Struggle is indeed, "established by God." Struggle is inevitable, wholesome,

bound to continue as long as poverty, cold, disease, ignorance, filth, ugliness, folly, and death continue. Man must daily struggle against all obstacles to his mastery of Nature. He must tunnel mountains, bridge rivers, fly through the air, go to the bottom of the sea, fight fire and wild beasts and noxious pests. But when he goes to the wholesale, organised slaughter of his fellowmen, he engages in abnormal struggle and does what even lions and tigers do not do. They do not go *en masse* to fight their own species. No brutes war collectively against their own kind, though occasionally there may be a case of single combat among some species. But snakes do not kill snakes, nor a pack of wolves go out to kill another pack of wolves. The fox who steals a chicken is no more engaged in war than the farmer is who kills a chicken for his wife's Sunday dinner. Animals are like butchers, not like soldiers. Getting food is not war. War is a specific form of struggle which has no origin in brute inheritance. It goes against man's nature even more than murder. One man in a thousand may commit murder. The vast majority, though instinct with selfishness, never go so far as that. War was not developed as an institution until scores of thousands of years after the caveman joined with his fellows in mutual aid against primeval monsters and learned the benefit of co-operation. First, rudimentary language must

have been invented; then some form of clan and, later, some tribal organisations were developed. The caveman doubtless sometimes committed murder, though not with the cunning calculation of our high school bandits. But it took countless ages of development in civilisation before slow-witted *homo sapiens* could make war possible. War means organised, collective action with weapons, under discipline and authority of general, king, or chief. War is a product of the cunning, crafty side of civilisation which exercises the virtues of foresight, industry, inventive powers, and the leadership of dominating minds. As an institution it goes not very far back into prehistoric times.

The more civilisation has advanced, the greater has man's wickedness and power of wholesale destruction of his own species become. Degree of wickedness depends on knowledge, and on ability to avoid this organised destruction of his own kind. The brains that can invent tanks and battleships and lyddite are highly developed, and capable, if turned to logic, ethics, and economics, of devising methods that do not set man's natural instinct at defiance in the settlement of disputes, and of seeing through the hoary sophistry of confounding struggle with war and pronouncing war "established by God."

The "cut of the whip" was not needed to incite

men to feverish activity in building New York and Chicago skyscrapers, in cutting the Suez and Panama canals, in reaching the poles, in harnessing Niagara and Muscle Shoals, in fighting hookworm and yellow fever, and in revealing Tut-Ankh-Amen in his 3,000-year-old sarcophagus. War did not make civilisation. Mental, moral, and physical exertion made civilisation.

As to war having been "the chief or leading condition of human progress," this progress began when man learned to talk, to make a fire, a raft, a wheel, to make all manner of implements down to the printing-press, the steam engine, the electric light, the automobile, telephone, radio, and to assuage human suffering. It came from the power of imagination and sympathy, from almost everything except from bloodshed, devastation, waste, and the aftermath of bitterness and revenge. President Jordan in his "Blood of the Nations" has demonstrated that war destroys the best blood and leaves populations to be fathered by the old, the weak, and the derelicts. Rome fell, not because of luxury. There was no luxury for slaves or for the vast multitude. She "petered out," largely, because for century after century she took the youth with the best blood and physique, and left them, without antiseptics, ether, or Red Cross, to perish in agony in order that greed for conquest and the prestige of

Roman arms might be gratified. Each generation thus depleted brought Rome finally to a generation of weaklings, the progeny of slaves and of incompetents. The same was true of Greece, Assyria, and Egypt. Only one nation of antiquity has kept its blood—unwarlike China, now incited to alter its age-long policies and to imitate the armed Occident which “respects” only an armed nation.

General Summerall’s unconsciously inverted statement of the truth hardly needs refutation. The loss of forty thousand million dollars of our people’s wealth, in our land in which one conscript soldier in four could not write a letter in English or read an American newspaper, a land in which crime exceeds that in any other great nation, and in which divorce breaks up one home in seven, a land which has impoverished foreign customers, seems utterly forgotten by this master in the technique of war. He holds the doctrine which finds war good *per se*, which encourages its continuance, seeing it has such infinite capacity for our betterment. We had been told that generals fought only to end war, but there seem to be exceptions who would encourage slaughter for the sake of its moral benefit.

POLICE AND INSURANCE

Says the *Kansas City Times*: “It is ridiculous to hold that military training tends to bring on war.

One might argue with equal reasoning that training a youth to fight fire would make him an incendiarist: or that training a youth for police duty would make him a bandit."

Said Admiral McKean: "The policemen do not start street fights, nor do the firemen, fires, and neither does the navy stir up strife." Mr. McNider of the War Department asked the Woman's Republican Club of Boston: "Is it a bad policy to rig up a set of automatic sprinklers so that the next fire can be put out before it gets under way?"

Former Secretary Weeks in an address at West Point was quoted as saying: "If it were not for the restraining effect of military establishments of the nations of the world, an indescribable state of chaos would result and civilisation would be rapidly terminated through self-destruction."

A false analogy which makes a vivid picture in the mind may do more to create war conditions than do armies and navies. The men who do the fighting, do not make war except when they are allowed to engage in propaganda, and are of official rank and undertake to permeate the press and the public mind with sophistical talk which is as often genuinely sincere as that of any anti-evolutionist of Tennessee or Texas.

There is nothing which throws such a glamor over the soldier's work as confounding it with the

police. Talk to any audience about the Boston police strike, the looting and panic which ensued, tell them that what police are to our cities, armies and navies are to our nation; show that we might as well abolish the police as abolish army and navy, appeal to their sentiments in the interest of law and order, of righteousness, safety of home and fire-side, and the whole body of virtuous, patriotic citizens will thunder applause and go forth convinced. This is the easy stunt of our military propagandists as they address schools, colleges, and parents to enlist recruits for the summer training camps and give eloquent pleas before Rotary Clubs and women's alliances.

But let us consider the flaw in the argument. The function of police is essentially a kindly, protective function, guarding the public in time of fire, looking after lost babies, telling householders to put ashes on the icy sidewalks, etc., and watching out for bandits and burglars. About once in two days, in some sections, in others oftener, the policeman makes an arrest. He does not punish the criminal; he calls the patrol wagon and takes his man to court. He gives his testimony and returns to his beat. He is not allowed to punish. When Boston police once used their sticks too freely over the heads of Technology students in a class fight between Freshmen and Sophomores, their wages were docked for a

month. The sole function of police when they use any force at all is to *take to court*. Naturally, if attacked, they defend themselves, as any one would, and may rightly shoot in self-defence. The point to be observed is that armies and navies never convey to court. They are the agents of nations that refuse to take international disputes to court, but who prefer to settle them by explosives. They feel that honour can be retrieved by dynamite, by mangling innocent enemy conscripts, by destroying the work of centuries, that boundary lines may be settled, and injustice by past generations rectified by the use of poison gas and cruisers. The soldiers on both sides are almost entirely helpless innocents, always lied to by the real makers of war who do not go to war themselves. Few wars could be begun or continued except on the basis of misunderstanding and lies. Courts aim to sift evidence carefully and get the truth. War never does, nor do the few men who make war.

Armies and navies are *rival bodies*. Why do we have them? Because other nations do. Police never are rival bodies. The police of Albany are not preparing to defend themselves against the police of Buffalo. The militia or constabulary of one state are not called to go against the militia or constabulary of another state. Sheriffs read riot acts, and fire on an approaching mob that wants to break

down a jail door and hang an untried black man to the lamppost; sheriffs, police, militia exist to promote law and order and to force disputants to take their case to court, or to be peaceable. Until the millennium we shall need non-rival bodies, under collective control to keep order. Had Secretary Weeks said: "If it were not for the restraining effect of non-rival bodies under joint control and having police functions an indescribable state of chaos would result and civilisation would be rapidly terminated through self-destruction," there would be very much to say for it. Nevertheless, millions have existed in Africa and Asia and lived to old age without ever seeing a policeman. The Secretary apparently conceived of practically all mankind desiring to be lawless and only restrained by fear from robbery and murder. A town of 13,000 inhabitants in Maine has had only two policemen. Probably not ten per cent of our inhabitants would become bandits and cutthroats, even if they could. The vast majority know that to protect their own property, they must respect that of others. Let us have that type of force which takes thugs and thieves to court. Let us have more police, and let their work and that of the courts and parole boards be done more thoroughly. Let us teach every child that nations as well as cities, if they organise, can have a police force, and that non-rival bodies, under

world-control, will end rival armies and navies, if the rising generation learns to think logically and to see through false analogies and flamboyant rhetoric.

How about "insurance," a favorite term of Theodore Roosevelt's, as applied to armies. The word is used with two meanings. Usually it means money paid by insurance companies after a disaster, whether of fire, hail, or death. When comparison is made with the army, it is always used in the sense of protection, as it is obvious that armies pay no damages. The army is compared to the fireman. But when a fireman fights fire, he does not do it with fire. He does not pour on gasoline. He fights fire with water or ashes that smother and put out a blaze. The soldier is compelled to fight slaughter with slaughter, battleship with battleship, gas with more powerful gas. But perhaps it is claimed that the army protects all the time that it is not used, that it frightens away evildoers, that if it is large enough and strong enough, it ensures protection. Said Theodore Roosevelt: "So long as we have a strong army and navy, just so long and no longer shall we have peace." Is not this guessing, and guessing that belies history? During most of our history we have had a very small army and navy yet no nation ever declared war against us. China for four thousand years and Japan for hundreds of

years did not have a navy. It is precisely the nations that have had strong armies and navies that have gone to war.

Said Frank H. Simonds: "In the larger sense, it is plain now that the war brought no victors and no vanquished. Europe lost the war, not Germany or her allies; and in the same sense it was Europe and not any individual people or government, monarch or prime minister, who willed the struggle, not deliberately, not directly, but by the acceptance of a system which sooner or later could end only as it did end. It is certain that it was the war system and the war preparations on every hand that terrified every nation and made for war, not peace."

Rear Admiral J. S. Murdock, retired, said: "When we can do away with our police forces, our criminal courts and jails, in our nation, which we like to consider the leader in the march of progress, and rely on the moral or ethical nature of the criminal to prevent burglary, arson, or murder, we may consider ourselves on the first step toward the development of 'Law, not War.' Human history is old and shows that law, justice, and morality are none of them efficacious as substitutes for war." He did not say, "for armies and navies," but for "war." A writer in the *Portland Press Herald* declared: "When the bootlegger, the dope fiend, the great criminal horde, become honest, law-abiding

citizens . . . when good government becomes an honest effort instead of a politician's game, then we may hope for universal peace." Said the British Commander-in-Chief at a London Conference of Territorial Chaplains: "Why should we dare to think that we can change human nature in a few years because war has become more terrible than it was in past ages? Wars will not cease, and can not cease so long as human nature remains as it is, and no human agency can possibly change the main characteristics of human nature. If God wishes to change human nature, he is hardly likely to do so by playing upon our weaknesses—fear of death and the horror of pain and discomfort."

Said Major General Charles F. Farnsworth: "I believe that wars in the future will occur just as they have done in the past. I feel that it will come to our country during the lives of many of us, just as it has come to every nation on the earth at short intervals of time. Such hours will come to every country. So long as individuals will fight, even when they have courts to which they may appeal, we must expect that nations that have no court of appeal will fight. When all men and women have always in their mind a true conception of service, then, and not till then, will war disappear."

Said John R. McQuigg, once national commander of the American Legion: "Let us remember that

world courts and Hague tribunals can not accomplish the impossible. They can not change human nature in the space of a few years. With the most magnificent territorial empire on which the sun shines, the United States of America is the richest prize of the ages, the greatest inheritance since time began. It will be ours only for so long as the world knows that we are ready to prepare to defend it."

Said Major General Edwards: "This soft, mushy, propaganda, rampant throughout the country to-day, of peace at any price, peace with dishonour, assumes that there has been a fundamental change in human nature."

Said Count Antonio Cippico, Italian Senator, at the Williamstown summer Conference: "Given the actual economic world struggle, it seems to me utterly useless to attempt the complete abolition of war. War is a cruel necessity . . . biology is based on a perpetual struggle; chemistry on continued reactions. It is in vain therefore to condemn that strife or violent reaction which after all is life itself."

Said Admiral L. R. de Stiguer: "If war is a crime, all who participate in it are criminals, all monuments to outstanding events of war, such as the Bunker Hill monument, are memorials to wrong; if war is a crime then you must repudiate Washington,

Lincoln, Grant and all who have been instruments in forming our American institutions."

Said Chaplain Herbert S. Johnson, a regular officer in the army: "The tendency to make war springs from the same source as lying, theft, murder, adultery, and will last as long as the tendency to those other vices of human selfishness."

The above quotations present a medley of widely prevalent fallacies which need careful sifting. They are based chiefly on two deeply embedded ideas: one, that war cannot end until human nature changes, and, secondly, that what has been is bound to be. Added to this is the assumption that those who are urging that war be now declared by international action to be henceforth a crime have ever held that past wars, before there was a beginning of world organisation, or a World Court set up, were in the same category as future wars after they were once outlawed. Christians honour Hebrew patriarchs, though like Jacob, they may have had two wives. All abolitionists have honoured Washington and Jefferson, though they were slave-holders. All peacemakers honour Grant who fought in a civil war, as they honour the leaders of the Revolutionary War which was really a civil war, fought, as we now recognise, between progressives and reactionaries on both sides the Atlantic. Civil war is in a different

category from international war, and as yet there are no world agencies to cope with it. All rational persons must perceive that with the growth of enlightenment and of substitution of new remedies for old evils, our new scruples, due to new knowledge and changed conditions, do not imply a reckless condemnation of men who under other conditions acted according to their light.

The assumption that human nature does not change is irrelevant. The abolition of war is not a question of human nature, or of some miracle. It is a question of *Organisation*. There are not only economic causes of disputes, which Count Cippico held must lead to war, but racial, religious, and endless other causes of disputes. *Disputes are not war*. They need not lead to war any more than disputes between individuals lead to murder or to duels, which are now outlawed. The most cursory glance at history shows that there has been no essential change in human mental capacity or physical instincts since the days of Homer and King David.

When clans coalesced with other clans and ceased fighting each other; when tribes united and built cities; when shires in England, and provinces in France united and stopped fighting each other; when Saxon, Welsh, and Scots stopped fighting and created Great Britain; when thirteen quarrelsome colonies, fast disintegrating, became firmly knit

under the Constitution, so that one state has never fought another state since then—there was no change in man's instincts. Italian babies are probably not better than they were in the days of Dante or Saint Francis, but Italian cities which fought each other then have extended their common interest and now, under one flag, one king, and one Parliament, no longer fight. A hundred weak little dukedoms and principalities, abolishing customs barriers between them and forts and guards, and becoming a strong Germany, did so without creating any change in their inborn instincts. Progress has been marked by extending the area of common interests: the printing press, the photograph, the steam engine, locomotive, and radio are not changing human nature, but are they not changing human knowledge and experience, and extending human understanding and sympathies and so altering human action? The man who prates about human nature preventing the end of war is shooting not at the mark, but childishly shooting into the air. He is blind to the whole point at issue. Ideas change and therefore actions change, but man's innate instincts remain essentially the same and will continue to do so.

Darwin rightly distinguished the savage from the civilised man, chiefly by his lack of imagination and inability to sympathise and have fellowship with one outside his tribe. The new extension of com-

mon interests in a world in which extensive foreign investments and exports make it imperative to be on good terms with customers, has introduced elements which are to control the future. Do they not make the precedent of the frequency of ancient wars worthless under our new conditions? Is not the militarist who argues from the past on the basis of human nature never changing, aside from his new knowledge of the powers of destruction, both illogical and a "back-number"?

Theft, laziness, and cruelty—sins connected with slavery—have continued since slavery as an institution was outlawed. Sins of the flesh and individual murder will continue indefinitely after war is outlawed by the nations. Organised, systematic, legalised war is essentially different from multiple murder by individuals each with a different and personal motive. The War System will end when governments *will* it. These will do so when the plain people are convinced of its futility and demand that all nations share in World Organisation, provide substitutes for war, and use those substitutes. There are endless causes of disputes and there always will be. There is only one cause of war—Inadequate World Organisation. Individuals lust for drink, for revenge, but no individuals lust collectively for war. The peoples in every nation in the World

War carried on mutual annihilation either from fear or sense of duty.

There is a mournful illusion lurking in all these confident assertions quoted. It is that it is possible for war to go on repeatedly as it has in the past. Yet the very men who utter these fallacies know that science has made it possible to turn London in three hours into a heap of ashes, with eight million corpses, as Mr. Edison assured us. Every day demonstrates the futility of force under modern conditions to prevent war by intimidation or permanently to settle disputes. The war system must stop or white civilisation will end. The propaganda in military schools and camps of the dangerous fallacies above mentioned, with no word about available substitutes for war, while they may not promote love of war, do promote continued belief in the war system and are working to frustrate attempts to abolish it. The President of Norwich University, the well-known military institution, is reported to have told his students: "The only peace worth having is obtained by instant readiness to fight when wronged." Were an individual wronged, or if the town of Norwich or the state of Vermont were wronged, he would say: "Take the case to Court." But if the nation decides, by itself, that it is wronged, would he call for redress by slaughter? not slaughter of the original wrong-doers, but by

the innocents whom the government can coerce to fight against others equally innocent?

This propaganda fosters the conceit that our country has never gone to war needlessly.

Said a writer in the *Press Herald*, Portland, Me.: "The pacifists like the poor, we have with us always. Washington knew them. They would not fight nor would they help those who could and did. They prevented Washington from organising an army of veterans to uphold the cause of liberty, and when the war was over they came into an enjoyment of all the things independence brought. Abraham Lincoln had many bitter experiences with pacifists. They said: 'Let the erring sisters depart in peace' . . . From Bull Run to Appomattox Lincoln had the pacifists always hounding, abusing him, villifying him, obstructing him. More than once the pacifist chorus has imperilled the country. We became a nation in spite of them. The Republic was saved and its black citizens set free in spite of them."

Said Colonel William H. Monroe, U. S. Army: "Frenzied pacifists are again abroad bombarding our defenceless heads with the poison gas of misrepresentation and disloyalty. But there is little danger of any one getting caught in the clouds of absurdities broadcasted by these flighty fanatics . . . I wonder if these paid pacifist propagandists realise that they are tackling mentalities of no mean calibre

with tainted pabulum that ordinary common sense has long since rejected. I wonder at the brazen-faced effrontery with which these apostles of peace at any price bid us lay aside our gas-masks and take a whiff or two at their delectable concoctions of vile gasosity . . . I wonder how these birds of bolshevistic tendency dare fly in the faces of intelligent people dragging in their foul talons the flag of this nation and voicing contempt for our laws and institutions by their shrill cries and frenzied floutings of our overworked army and navy courageously and unselfishly devoted to carrying out the provisions of our National Defense Act . . . against all enemies at home or abroad, pacifistic, communistic, or bolshevistic . . . I wonder how little these flying buzzards of ill-omen, these calamity howlers of the air, know the patriotic heart of our people, the deep-seated determination of all of our citizens to defend themselves . . . by the only means that has ever withstood aggression—an adequate army and navy. I wonder if these visionary fanatics dream that the fathers and mothers of this land will ever fail to rally to the defence of their flag because forsooth of the slinking hyenas of pacifism and disloyalty that howl within or without our gates.”

The above explosion of rhetoric so accurately expresses the attitude of mind of many citizens, instructed by members of the army and navy and

Legion, that further quotation is unnecessary. A decent respect for the opinion of mankind demands definitions. When an inflamed imagination sets up scarecrows and bogies and valiantly overthrows them with vituperation, the exercise may be exhilarating but it is not convincing to sane minds.

A militarist is not a person who wants war. He is one who, whether a military man or a sweet old lady, holds essentially the fallacies above expressed. He gives undue emphasis to the efficacy of military force. It is one's philosophy, not one's profession, that makes one a militarist.

"Pacifist" or "pacifiste" is simply the French form for the word which Jesus used when he said, "Blessed are the peacemakers." Who are peacemakers and what are they trying to do in these days when another war threatens world suicide? First let us say, that Tories and "Copperheads" were not pacifists. The editor who confounds them with the Tories who tried to thwart Washington can not show that they were Quakers, conscientious objectors, non-resisters, or pacifists. They simply stood by King George like good monarchists and would have been willing to fight in any cause that they believed in. So far from their coming "into enjoyment of all that independence has wrought," as was shown in a previous chapter, 100,000 at great expense and trouble, after the war, emigrated to Nova Scotia and

Canada where they could be under British law. The men who "hounded, abused and villified Lincoln" were men who condoned secession and slavery. They were not Quakers, non-resisters, conscientious objectors or "pacifists" like Garrison and Whittier. All this is too obvious to require refutation.

Many peacemakers refuse to be classed as "pacifists," unless in every debate they can define for themselves the meaning of the word that has been so dragged in the dust and distorted from all semblance to its real meaning. The term pacifist or peacemaker is as vague as the word Christian. A Christian may be a Jesuit, a Presbyterian, a Second Adventist, a member of the Greek Church, or a Unitarian. So peacemakers may hold varied views as to methods, but their fundamental principles are practically alike as summed up in the chapter following.

CHAPTER VIII

THE POINTS OF VIEW OF MILITARISTS AND PEACEMAKERS

The majority of militarists deprecate war. They may or may not be military men. They are those who hold certain theories about war based on the assumption that it is rooted in human nature, is as inevitable as sin, and can be kept in bounds only as nations guard themselves by armed force. They consider armies and navies the "first line of defence" and in each nation they believe that their "adequate preparedness" has not been reached.

Military officers are not only often busy teaching military tactics in school and camp, but in instructing the public in a wide-spread propaganda as to the philosophy of war, the reaction of foreign nations to our policies, and the probabilities regarding our danger from attack. In regard to the last they are sometimes very positive. Some years before the World War, in a tour in the Far East, Dr. Charles W. Eliot was interested to find that only one of the many American officers whom he met was not positive that we were immediately going to war with

Japan, though he found no indication among the Japanese that they wanted or expected war.

A few illustrations from a vast number of similar ones illuminate the type of instruction that is being eagerly imbibed on Main Street, in the college drill hall, and in military summer camps, and which points the pen for editorials read by millions. May not utterances like these have a profound effect in shaping national policy and so deserve examination?

Said Colonel O. F. Robinson in July, 1926, in an address reported in one of the Washington army periodicals: "We are to-day the richest prize in the world for an irate nation. A successful war against us by a combination of European nations would be a quick and easy way of settling their debts to us . . . An infinite wisdom has established the conditions under which we live and put in being the great law of the universe—the law of the survival of the fittest." The first reaction to this of the average man is fear. Here is, he thinks, an expert on all that pertains to war. Of course he must know our dangers.

A "prize" is something that can be taken and used and enjoyed. Gold, jewels, pictures, produce, can be stolen from an individual. But a nation's possessions as shown in a previous chapter belong to a different category. By their destruction what enemy could become a dollar richer? If our European

debtors unite and simply say: "We can not, and therefore shall not, pay," what could we do about it? Should we send our sons to kill their sons to compel them to pay what they say is impossible? So long as the Canadian frontier remains unguarded, an attack from a nation with the greatest navy would be unthinkable. Conceive of other debtors, with their currency at less than a quarter of normal value, taxing their people further so as to wage successful war on us 3,000 miles away. As for the survival of the fittest, as has previously been stated, science means by that, not survival of the best, but of that qualified to survive in a particular environment. A fish is better fitted than a man to survive in the sea, a bird fitted for the air; in a social environment of thieves and murderers the Emersons and Edisons would first succumb. Pilate survived while Jesus was crucified; martyrs perished in the flames while Nero fiddled. A scientific phrase detached from its real meaning is dangerous.

Said General James G. Harbord: "Our land resounds to the whine of the professional pacifist, demanding total disarmament. Yet none of them take the equally logical advocacy of discharging the police to prevent crime, disbanding the fire department to stop fires, and dismissing the doctor to prevent disease." This philosopher thus teaches that the functions of armies are essentially analogous to

those of police and firemen and doctors. To this astonishing assumption one must constantly reiterate that it is the business of firemen to destroy fire, an enemy wholly different from themselves, with something different from fire itself. While the conscript is forced to destroy beings with bodies, wives, and sweethearts just like his own, and using the same means as they—guns against guns, battleships against battleships, gas against gas. Soldiers belong to rival bodies; firemen and police do not. The confusion of thought which confounds the two is a dominant factor in militarism. Men who are experts in mathematics and mechanics and military science often find simple problems in logic beyond them. It seems needless to argue that the work of destruction by the soldier has not the slightest analogy to the healing work of the physician. As to the ever insistent argument about the army as police, which has previously been analysed, the antidote to the fallacy needs repetition every year in every grade of Grammar School and in adult clubs and classes which are frequently told, as if it were an axiom, that as we have always had war we shall continue to have it, so long as men are sinful.

Few peacemakers demand "total disarmament" of their own nation. They know that the great nations will disarm only by simultaneous action. The arguments of most military men, except a few

like General Tasker Bliss and General Allen, are for measures that assume the perpetuity of the war system. No wonder that after thirty years of playing "war-games," of thinking of every nation as a possible enemy, substitutes for war seem to them intangible and remote. No one criticises the experts in their own field. What the public has a right to demand is that there be recognised the profound distinction between the science of war which officers are competent to teach, and the philosophy of human nature or of the war system about which they have shown themselves conspicuously incompetent to teach the public. The last man who should usurp the function of the statesman, philosopher, or the preacher is the technician in the art of war.

The kind of reasoning that detects flaws in submarines is not the same as that required to understand our relations to Mexico or Japan. The kind of prophecy which can foretell what steel and gas can do is not that needed at Locarno conferences or in the college lecture room. Shooting straight at targets does not help one to think straight. The obedience taught under direction and compulsion does not develop the self-control and voluntary obedience to conscience that good citizenship demands.

Children can be taught what eminent technicians fail to see, like the fallacies in the following asser-

tions: "War is nature's plan for the elevation of the whole human race," said Colonel Traub, Chief of Staff, 77th Division, to the Daughters of the American Revolution. Secretary Wilbur is reported to have said: "Preparation for war has a high moral value." The distinction between struggle and war which Colonel Traub, like many others, has failed to see has already been discussed. If preparation for war has a high moral value then why not have more of it and let every woman share in the moral uplift? Preparation for war before 1914 was universal. The nations were so well prepared that they could wipe out thirty millions of lives by battle, famine, and the after consequences of war; they could destroy in four years over three hundred thousand million dollars' worth of wealth. The difference between man's struggle with environment which stimulates, educates, and uplifts him, and the war system—collective slaughter of the human species—is so great that the thought which puts them both into the same category is appallingly absurd. It is this medley of false assumptions, perverted logic, and misreading of history which stun the reader in the pronouncements of so many military men. Admiral Bradley M. Fiske has warned us that we are surrounded by "nations not only virile but ambitious, intelligent, and poor who want what we want and realise that we have achieved it largely through

war." The Admiral seems to have forgotten that we obtained Florida, the vast Louisiana Territory, and Alaska without shedding a drop of blood. His assumption, like that of Colonel Robinson, is that poor and envious nations could secure advantage by injuring the one nation from whom they want to borrow; that by more destruction, loss of trade, and bitterness, and the endangering of civilisation, any nation could prosper.

General Fries tells us that "the army has been investigating various disarmament and pacifist societies" and he has declared, according to report, that the "insidious pacifist is to be feared more than the man with torch, gun, or sword." "Pacifists" deal only in argument, and argument it seems is more dangerous than fire and sword! Evidently the Beatitudes need expurgation and peacemakers are not blessed if they oppose explosives as a method of settling controversies. All this loose, often casual talk of eminent officers is taken seriously and sent out in Associated Press dispatches. Who commissioned the army to play the inquisitor, and investigate those who are peaceably trying to bring about peaceful settlement of international disputes? The cry of "Bolshevik, traitor and communist" which militarists both in and out of the army have raised against them, especially since the World War, have had about the same foundation as the cry once

raised: "gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners."

A careful exposé of the systematic and extensive propaganda against liberal and "radical" thought has been edited by Norman Hapgood in a volume entitled, "Professional Patriots." A survey has been made in this book of editors and organisations which make a specialty of discrediting those who do not hold their own views, among whom are many peace workers, explicitly named. Some of these organisations give no financial reports. The financial backing of many of these comes chiefly from well-known capitalists who desire under the guise of patriotism to alarm the public with wildly exaggerated claims as to menace to property in all movements that would tend to change the *status quo*. Under the title of "Better America Federation," with headquarters in Los Angeles, one of their agencies has attracted much attention through a laudable emphasis on the Constitution and prize oratorical contests and a widely circulated weekly *News Letter*. The Federation as stated in this book "is supported chiefly by public utility companies and certain large commercial interests of southern California. Through its board of directors it is tied up with corporations who utilise the patriotic appeal to distract attention from their own purposes . . . The Federation is allied with the controlling busi-

ness interests of southern California." It maintains a staff of salaried speakers which it furnishes to social and commercial clubs. An article in *Better Schools*, an educational journal of Los Angeles, once characterised thus many committees of the Federation operating under various names to carry out its purposes:

"So hateful are the policies of this group of reactionaries, that they find a frequent change of name necessary. When their hypocrisy and fraud are discovered, they shift to a new one." (The article catalogues these aliases and continues): "and now having worn out all the old masks, they are appearing as the committee of One Thousand and the committee of Ten Thousand."

Senator J. M. Inman speaking from the floor of the State Senate said:

"We see the Better America Federation at work using what control it possesses to serve the special interests. Under a false title, which would seem to indicate that the organisation is aiming to make American citizenship and better national life, we find it being used openly and actively in trying to aid these corporate interests in their endeavour to evade just taxation."

Among the most aggressive propagandists is the *Woman Patriot* of Washington, started in Washington in 1922 by the anti-suffragists. The paper

is dedicated to the "defence of the family and the state" and "against feminism and socialism." It has attacked peace movements and the Federal Children's Bureau and its president has characterised Mrs. Florence Kelley, the valiant secretary of the Consumers' League, as "perhaps the ablest legislative general communism has produced." Another very active assailant of peace workers is Fred R. Marvin who in the New York *Commercial* has exposed so-called "subversive movements." Mr. Marvin's efforts have been prodigious and in 1927, according to "Professional Patriots," he had four libel suits, each for \$25,000, on his hands in the courts. R. M. Whitney of the American Defense Society published a series of widely-read articles on "The Reds in America" in which his publisher was involved in a \$100,000 libel suit, which was dropped when retraction was made.

The National Civic Federation has perhaps the most extensive literature of propaganda against peace workers, who are continually linked up in the publications of Mr. Ralph Easley, the chairman, with bolshevists and communists. He says: "We regard their theory of internationalism with its contempt of love of country as one leading to disloyalty to our government and the destruction of nationality." The notorious "Spider-web" chart published in Henry Ford's *Dearborn Independent* was pre-

pared in 1923 by the woman librarian of the Chemical Warfare Service of the War Department, headed by General Fries. It attempted to show the web of lines between organisations and women leaders which were supposed to tie together in an international conspiracy organisations of women, all influenced by Moscow. The theory presented is that the result of the peace movement, whether consciously or not, is to disarm the United States so that the bolshevists can take it. Organisations like the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the League of Women Voters were shown to be in some measure affiliated with organisations like the National Council for Prevention of War—a clearing-house for anti-militarist effort, and therefore assumed to be under the influence of Moscow.

In New York, the notorious Lusk committee on Investigating Seditious Activities was unable to make good on its fantastic charges: "Its chief case was thrown out of court and the two laws which it sponsored for the control of the loyalty of schools and teachers in New York were repealed by the legislature, and its part in throwing out of the legislature five duly elected assemblymen who were Socialists was condemned throughout the country." The four-volume report of the committee cost the state \$100,000; copies were sent to libraries, editors,

and patriotic organisations, and its gross exaggerations and misinformation continue to mislead the public. Its list of 62 persons holding "dangerous, destructive and anarchistic sentiments" includes Miss Jane Addams, Dr. David Starr Jordan, George W. Kirchway and Miss Lillian Wald. Newton D. Baker, then Secretary of War, in response to letters and telegrams regarding this list declared: "The War Department does not undertake to censor the opinions of the people of the United States. It has not authority to classify such opinions. In the particular list are names of people of great distinction, exalted purity of purpose, and life-long devotion to the highest interests of America and mankind. Miss Jane Addams, for instance, lends dignity and greatness to any list in which her name appears."

There are a score or so of other organisations of the same inquisitorial type as those mentioned. Some of them are managed by genuine fanatics, probably as sincere as the Mr. Braman mentioned in "Professional Patriots" who attempted to federate "over fifty patriotic organisations with a membership of 7,000,000"; half of these protested against the use of their names without their authority. Mr. Braman was reported in the *New York Times* to have said: "The Reds are holding 10,000 meetings in this country every week and 350 radical papers have been established here in the last six months."

In an address on "The Spirit of the Times," the president of the National Security League is reported as saying: "We have 500,000 communists meeting weekly publishing fifty papers attacking your country, your government, your right to prosper."

What is to be said of these statements but that there are many ill-balanced and credulous citizens who accept without investigation unproved assertions. It is probable that, according to recent careful estimate, out of our 120,000,000 not over 10,000 are communists. Some of them are doing some harm but, on the whole, these few crude and ill-trained persons, usually foreigners who have had hard experiences and have heard little of the best which America can offer, are doing far less harm in our country than certain prosperous and inquisitorial bodies who, sometimes sincerely and sometimes for selfish ends, systematically organise to condemn and silence those who hold a different philosophy.

What is the philosophy of the peacemaker? At the risk of repetition of some previous matter it may be thus summed up: In all sects and parties there are always a few impractical extremists who injure their own cause by trying to take the fourth step before they have taken the first; it is cruelly unjust to proclaim that they are typical. The typical peace-

maker would agree substantially to the following statements:

1. Internationalism involves "no contempt for love of country" and is in complete harmony with a proper nationalism. There can be no internationalism until first there is nationalism, just as there can be no nation until there are first smaller units that compose it. Love of home does not preclude love of one's city, one's own state, and one's own nation. But, as above all nations is Humanity, there must be a larger as well as a smaller patriotism, each perfectly consistent with the other. The few fanatics who would abolish all national boundaries, might equally well abolish all city and state boundaries, and do away with all organisation but one on the earth; but they are negligible in numbers and less harmful than the very many who would make our boundaries the limit of our allegiance and responsibility.

2. Future war between nations can and ought to be abolished in a generation. It has become futile for the achievement of national advantage, whatever may be said about past war and revolts and revolutions within a country.

3. War is not due to human nature which in most respects has changed little since the days of Plato. Customs, ideas, and environment change, but human

instincts remain about the same. War is due to the failure hitherto of the largest units of human organisation to adopt the same methods which have worked successfully for centuries with the smaller units of city, state, and provinces.

4. False assumptions, false analogies, ignorance of what real self-interest requires, are the obstacles to be removed through new methods and new objectives in education. Ordinary education largely ignores the most vital matters.

5. The logical line of action is to secure treaties between all important armed nations, whether members or nonmembers of the League of Nations, for a peaceful settlement of all future disputes. This must be followed by simultaneous reduction of armament as soon as sanctions are provided by an organised world as a substitute for rival military forces.

6. As it is always a few powerful people in control of a system of government who make wars, a comparatively few can and probably will end war. The great bulk of the population of the globe, being illiterate and helpless to shape international policy, are relatively negligible in this matter. War will end through the action of intelligent, forward-thinking people in six or eight influential countries which create wealth, foreign markets, and armaments. When these come to see that their prosperity under

modern conditions depends on the abolition of war and war preparations, and that this demands adequate world organisation, the rest of the world will co-operate in terminating the present war system. It must be reiterated that it is the "educated" and "Christian" nations, not illiterates or heathen, which have wrought most destruction.

7. Nearly all peacemakers abhor the atheism, the communism, and the coercion of the masses exercised by the self-denying, sincere fanatics who, for the time-being, are in power in the land that has made the wild attempt to bring about a world revolution in the interests of the proletariat, and have failed. There is slight danger of their influence in America and of its being permanent in Europe outside their own borders.

8. Almost all peacemakers believe that there must be a minimum of the police type of force whether for city, state, nation, or family of nations under collective control. What they aim to abolish is the use of national, rival military force.

9. Peacemakers reject the imperialist policy which claims that our "domain" should extend wherever our nationals' lives and property and interests are involved.

10. American peacemakers are alarmed at the naïve conceit and presumption with which we are increasingly regarding our small neighbours who

question our suzerainty. As Professor Moon has said, our annexation of Porto Rico was a piece of "pure imperialism." We criticise the imperialistic ambition of Old World powers and are apparently unaware that we have already adopted their own policies. Peacemakers know that *facilis descensus Averni*. We are in danger not only of continuing the present suspicion and resentment of certain parts of Latin-America but of adopting a policy that will make it permanent and detrimental to all our interests. We perceive how easily unthinking citizens are hoodwinked by the unchallenged assertion that "The Calles fetish of Mexico for the Mexicans, imperils a hegemony essential to Pan-American unity and economic solidarity. The plain fact is that our disinterested (*sic*) sponsorship for Latin-America was never more precarious than now." *

11. Peacemakers perceive that the psychology of our nations is undergoing rapid transformation, and leading us complacently to act on the principle that whatever our political procedure we are morally right, and that our will must be law. While interference with turbulent and backward peoples may sometimes be justified, this should never be done but by *collective* action. Disinterested states should be asked to co-operate in an extreme emergency if interference for police purposes is called for. Only so

* Marcossin in the *Saturday Evening Post*, February, 1927.

can there be any confidence in claims that the interference is for righteous purposes. Most peacemakers deprecate our delay and indefinite postponement of fulfilment of the promise in the Jones Act to grant independence to the Filipinos as soon as they achieved "a stable government." Filipinos are as competent as Abyssinians or Liberians of self-government and assumption of international obligations as members of the League of Nations, in which they would have due protection from aggression. Peacemakers all recognise the insidious growth of the spirit of intolerance, and the increased reliance on force accompanied by vociferous assertions that we can never become a militaristic people.

12. Nearly all peacemakers desire the entrance of the United States into the World Court and the League of Nations, under whatever conditions this can be brought about satisfactorily to our government and the League. Until our entrance they urge all possible co-operation with the League, and Congressional action to ensure that we will take no advantage by permitting supplies of armaments from our country to a nation that is recognised by the League as an "aggressor nation"; or at least that we will deny protection to our nationals who dare to do so.

13. Peacemakers rejoice to see that in our new treaties the old reservation of matters of vital inter-

est and honour is withdrawn. They all believe in our signing all-inclusive arbitration treaties pledging some form of peaceful settlement regarding all disputes. Senator Kellogg's proposal, following the initial offer of M. Briand in April, 1927, for a treaty which should renounce war as the future policy between France and the United States, was for an extension of this idea in multilateral treaties. These are now being considered, and thus far favourably by the British government and the British Commonwealth of Nations, France, Italy, Japan, and are open to other nations to sign. If carried out and ratified by two-thirds of the United States Senate, this event would be epochal in history. It would be the beginning of constructive measures leading to further treaties providing methods of settling various types of disputes. This achievement would logically prevent any renewal of the preposterous naval building programme presented to Congress in 1928. This was reduced by the House of Representatives from seventy-one naval vessels to sixteen, owing to the unprecedented protests which poured in from all over the country. Forty-three nations have already signed pacific treaties of an all-inclusive character, and as yet we have not one. Even without ever entering the League of Nations we could thus attain security, and remove ourselves

from being the object of fear on the part of certain other nations.

A cardinal limitation of those who lay chief stress on the military side is their failure to look at the family of nations as a whole, and their thought of sovereignty as pertaining to their nations alone. What is needed is a clear view of the gradations of sovereignty, and of true and false patriotism.

CHAPTER IX

PATRIOTIC SONGS, SYMBOLS, AND SOCIETIES

"I care not who makes the laws of a country, if I may write its songs," is the oft-quoted dictum of one who knew the relation of cause and effect in history. It was a music hall ditty,

We don't want to fight,
But, by jingo, if we do,
We've got the ships,
We've got the men,
We've got the money, too,

which a generation ago inflamed the English people and had tremendous weight in creating war sentiment. It is matter for consideration whether children throughout our land are to be taught that "conquer we must, when our cause it is just." It would seem much like a survival of the mediæval superstition that the victim thrown into the river who could float was not guilty, and that Elsa's innocence could be proved by the valiant sword of Lohengrin. War is but a gigantic duel; the stronger and more skilful wins, regardless of justice. We won the Mexican

War, not because we were right, but because we were strong, as the Assyrians conquered the Jews for the same reason. Success is almost always on the side of "the heaviest battalions" in any war. Children who grow up with the ingrained notion that their country must always be right and, therefore, always successful, become the zealots and hot-heads who foment other wars.

"The Star Spangled Banner" has been selected by the army and navy as *the* national anthem, and a thoughtless public seems to assume that this is conclusive and the question is not to be reopened. So jealous are certain persons for the pre-eminence of this particular song, that one almost runs the risk of being called unpatriotic if he is heretical enough to question it. But the decision of the small body of army and navy officials, though somewhat influential in shaping public opinion, can settle nothing. The rulers of the republic, the people, must decide whether this song, written for a special time and place in the War of 1812, is to be their chief expression of national faith. "The Star Spangled Banner" is far from being great poetry, and it is vocally difficult—the people cannot sing it. These two defects should prevent its adoption as *the* national song. But it is also unsuited to many hours and places. At sunset, when the flag is lowered, is it not rather absurd to ask, "O, say, can you see by

the dawn's early light"? The song deals with one incident, and that a war incident. "The perilous night" was one special and comparatively unimportant night in our history. Whatever is special or local or refers to facts not generally known, is not suited for a national anthem, to be learned by heart, to be sung by millions of all classes, to shape the national ideals of a powerful people. As during our whole history we have been at war with foreigners less than one-tenth of the time, war should not be the sole topic referred to in our chief national anthem.

"My country," "sweet land of liberty," "freedom's holy light," "our father's God" are nobler and more universal themes than "the rocket's red glare, the bombs bursting in air." To-day, "America" is undeniably the American people's dearest national hymn as the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" is the most inspiring and poetic in its verse, and Eichberg's "To thee, O Country," presents the noblest music; while "America, the Beautiful" is the most comprehensive and is growing daily in favour. Why should not the army respect the feeling of the people, rather than the people obey the behest of a few army officers? Let "The Star-spangled Banner" be retained in the repertoire of military bands, and be sung sometimes with various other national songs, like "Hail, Columbia"; but let

the great body of civic patriots of our land choose as *the* national anthem a song which, like "America" or "America, the Beautiful," does not ignore the interests, life, and faith of a great Christian people. That "America" is sung to a tune of German origin, which is also used as the national air of our "kin beyond sea," and by the Swiss as well, does not condemn it, but rather gives an honourable historic ancestry for the national anthem of a great cosmopolitan people like our own. One of the most thrilling experiences of many sea voyages has been the rising at the close of the ship's concert and singing that air, common to both countries, each passenger singing the words of his own land. National anthems cannot be written to order: they must evolve. We may be long in finding the ideal one; England has not yet found hers. But let no silly shame because of the present doubt as to what our chief anthem shall be, hasten us to accept an unrepresentative and inadequate one.

The exaggerated attention given to the symbol of our country, so noticeable in the last few years, is in keeping with the exaggerated attention to all that is external and spectacular in modern life. The most sacred symbols of religion have in times past become such fetishes that for a time all who loved the thought for which they stood more than the symbols, have discarded them. There is danger of a

Puritan revolution sometime against patriotic symbols, if the symbol is allowed to become a fetish, and the real thing for which it stands is overshadowed by it.

An illustration of the extreme attention to a symbol was shown in the action of a certain society of "patriotic" women some years ago on the occasion of the arrest of a poor foreigner who had carried some potatoes in a flag and was obliged to pay a large share of his week's wages as a fine for his act, which, in his ignorance of the law, had seemed to him so innocent. The heroism of the policeman who had performed the brave deed of arrest they thought worthy to be honoured, and accordingly they arranged the presentation of a cup and flag, with an accompanying eulogy, as if he had risked his life in capturing a thug.

In a certain Patriotic Primer, in a long catechism for children upon the flag, we find the pupils called to state in answer to questions that the flag must be of "all wool bunting or silk." "The union must be one-third the length of the flag, extending to the bottom of the fourth red stripe." "The flag was first raised over Fort Stanwix, on the present site of the city of Rome, N. Y., August 2, 1777. The first salute ever given to it in a foreign country was on February 14, 1778. There were sixty-four designs made before the Stars and Stripes were adopted,"

etc. Betsy Ross is frequently mentioned on Flag Day, and children are taught that the first flag was made out of a soldier's white shirt, an old blue army coat, and a red petticoat. It is well enough to record these facts, but they are not important, not the kind of facts to emphasise. Is there not danger, in patriotism as well as in religion, of tithing mint and anise and cummin, and forgetting to emphasise the weightier matters? In the 1924 manual for immigrants of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, nine pages out of forty-one of original matter are devoted to the symbol of our country.

On Flag Day let the teacher discuss symbols in general and Aristotle's definition of man as a "symbol-making animal." Not only the wedding ring, the communion cup, the cross, the star and crescent, the Freemason's symbols, the bush before the inn, the barber's pole, the pawnbroker's gold balls, the dove, the olive leaf, and the scales of justice might be used as illustrations, but it should be shown that every car ticket and banknote and every word or figure is a symbol, as it stands for an idea. The flags of other countries should be mentioned, and the pupils' attention called to the fact that Norway, France, and several other countries besides ours have flags of red, white, and blue. Richard Le Gallienne's stirring poem on "War" well brings out the

LAW OR WAR

power of symbols and music, the soullessness often behind them, and the need of penetrating to their easy deceits.

War
I abhor;
And yet how sweet
The sound along the marching street
Of drum and fife, and I forget
Broken old mothers, and the whole
Dark butchering without a soul.

Without a soul—save this bright treat
Of heady music, sweet as hell;
And even my peace-abiding feet
Go marching with the marching street,
For yonder goes the fife,
And what care I for human Life;
The tears fill my astonished eyes,
And my full heart is like to break,
And yet it is embannered lies,
A dream those drummers make.

Oh, it is wickedness to clothe
Yon hideous, grinning thing that stalks
Hidden in music, like a queen
That in a garden of glory walks,
Till good men love the things they loathe;
Art, thou hast many infamies,
But not an infamy like this.

There are in the United States to-day scores of
thousands of American citizens of privileged birth,

descendants of the early founders of our country and of those who fought for its independence, who have joined societies which pass under the common title of "Patriotic." The members are not wholly responsible for the general title given by the public, as their avowed purpose is to concern themselves peculiarly with the reminiscent aspects of patriotism and to honour worthy ancestors. Their study has been valuable in preserving colonial relics and traditions, in instituting antiquarian research, and in bringing about greater reverence than we otherwise might have for the farmer and artisan who left the plough and shop in '76 to fight for independence. Had one the genial wit of Howells, one might venture to discuss some of the results of patriotic activity in these organisations without giving offence. But perhaps it is possible for an ordinary descendant of Revolutionary ancestors to say an earnest word to her compatriots that may be helpful and suggestive, and not be deemed impertinent or unfriendly. If the Father of his country were to address to-day the descendants of his old comrades of the days that tried men's souls, what would he say? Doubtless he would congratulate these men and women as belonging to a small class of the most privileged people who have ever lived, and he would perhaps contrast the limitations of the women of his time with the large leisure of many of these women of to-day.

Perhaps he might point out that the test of culture and character is the use of leisure. Great organisations of these men and women, privileged by birth, tradition, culture, and large freedom in the disposal of their time, are now being tested as to their patriotism; and might he not inquire whether many outside their organisations are not showing far more willingness to serve their country than those whose credentials admit them to these honoured bodies whose power for patriotic work is unrivalled? What would the heroes of '76 who fought with Washington be doing to serve their country were they alive in this year, when lynchings and murders and corruption in high places, when growing imperialism and militarism are belying the promise of our past, and to the south of us neighbours look on us with fear and disrespect? As women are the buyers and educators, they set the standard of living and the ideals of the child. They largely control the standards of amusements. They can practically control race prejudice and the tendency to a caste system, which always conduce to special privilege and militarism. We need women with a patriotism which is equal to sacrificing bridge-whist parties in order to teach little immigrant citizens, not colonial history, which they can learn at school, but the best American standards of wholesome living. We need *débutantes* with a patriotism

which is equal to some sacrifice of the parties and pleasure of the privileged for the help of the masses whose poverty, or ignorance, or disease menaces the republic. We need women of leisure who will bring to the busy men who earn their bread something of the vision and wide outlook over national problems which their clubs and reading ought to furnish. Probably the best patriotic work among women's organisations to-day is being done by those which are not labelled "patriotic." Whoever works against child labour and for conservation, education, and good citizenship is doing the highest form of patriotic service. A patriotism which will sacrifice as much for concrete countrymen as for an abstract idea called country is too rare among professional patriots. With a population in this country one-third of foreign parentage, and largely unacquainted with our literature, traditions, and political principles, it would seem as if the prime duty of patriots to-day was to enlighten these newcomers and lend a helping hand, with care not to patronise those who are counted as genuinely citizens as ourselves. Some organisations of patriotic women in Connecticut, by publishing common-sense advice to immigrants in their own language, have suggested a line of work which more might follow. What does the average Slav or Greek in Lowell mills or the Italian or Russian Jew in Chicago slums most need to make him

an American patriot? Is it stereopticon lectures on the battles of the Brandywine or Bennington, sometimes provided from "the chapter's" funds? Is it not, first of all, that personal friendliness which can alone bridge the chasm which yawns between culture and ignorance, between privilege and privation? Is it not that spirit of democracy which goes an arrow's flight above *noblesse oblige* and welcomes as potential bringers of gifts these toilers from the lands of Socrates, Dante, and Tolstoi?

Granted, as of course we all do, that the work of reminiscent patriotism has a proper place, are not our "sons" and "daughters" and "dames" too often in danger of overdoing this side of the matter? Memorials to the Revolutionary heroes are admirable when wrought in bronze or marble, but they have just as much to do with patriotism, and no more, as statues of the apostles have to do with religion. Let us erect them, let us have parliamentary law niceties and bunting; let us have genealogies and epitaphs, let us present loving-cups, and listen to recitations and eulogies and violin solos, and eat pink ices, and have exhibitions of Colonial samplers and pewter mugs; let us cultivate antiquarianism, genealogical research, and social intercourse; but, in the name of the forefathers who made real sacrifices for the country they loved, let us not call ourselves "patriots" unless we add to these harmless and

agreeable functions somewhat more definite, serious work in service, in doing what these men would do were they here to-day and were they confronting the insidious and terrible dangers of prosperity and wealth as nobly as they once confronted poverty and obloquy.

Just as the Church has awakened to perceive that it must have a forward movement and present a new and larger conception of Christianity, if it is still to nourish the great mass of common folk, so those of English blood who cherish the principles of the founders of the republic must awake to see that, unless a red-blooded, twentieth-century patriotism which demands present courage and sacrifice be better understood by all our "patriots," these principles may be unconsciously and ignorantly repudiated by the next generation of a population which marks our country as the melting pot of nations.

[There is one new aspect of the "patriotic" organisations which unhappily is growing more prominent and is deplorable. It has been well portrayed by a patriot whose ancestors came with those who settled Boston, whose own grandfather as a boy carried a powder-horn at Lexington and whose years have been devoted to carrying out the principles of the Founders. He has thus written of them:

"Why do the members of the various 'Patriotic Societies,' the various sons, daughters, dames, de-

scendants, almost invariably appear on the conservative side of public questions and frequently as persecutors, and reactionists? It is a strange outcome for people organised to perpetuate the memory of the great radicals and revolutionists of our history. It would be difficult to recall any evidence of these societies and the newer ones that have sprung up since the war, and which claim peculiarly the title of 'patriotic,' ever expressing interest in any method of preparedness except that connected with munitions and military training. Their suspicion of those who look on the agreement which has kept the peace between us and Canada for over a century as being the truest preparedness; the readiness with which their leaders credulously accept and circulate disparaging reports of those who like Jane Addams are trying to substitute law for war, has been in defiance of the spirit of the founders of the Republic. Doubtless the great body of members of the societies which are based upon heredity may deplore the extreme and denunciatory attitude of their leaders, who have tried to suppress free speech and slandered as 'bolshevists' and 'reds' persons whom some military man has told them to beware of. But if so, the rank and file have been dumb and have allowed the talkative and splenetic to slander other people without protest. 'Patriots' who would look with horror at stealing a purse, steal other people's

reputation with a chuckle. They have assumed that those who wish to do away with 'special privilege' want to abolish private property and must be communists; that whoever has urged our recognition of Russia must approve the fanaticism and injustice of the Soviet government; that if one member of a society has said wild foolish things, every member must be held responsible.

"There was held sometime ago in Washington a great Conference on the Cause and Cure of War. It was called by nine national women's organisations acting unitedly, among them the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the League of Women Voters, the Federation of Women's Clubs, The Young Women's Christian Association, the Women's Trade Union League and the Association of University Women, all earnestly concerned in the Peace cause. There were nearly a thousand people at the week's conference with Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt as its president and Mrs. Thomas G. Winter, chairman of the programme committee. It was a most important and impressive conference to everybody but the patriotic organisations. These mustered a hundred women at the New Willard the day after the conference adjourned to denounce the 'Catt convention' as they called it. The chief speaker was Captain —, formerly of the British Secret Service. His speech, said the Washington despatch, was 'a

warning against internationalism.' 'When I sat looking at those thousand women,' said the Captain, 'I thought is it not possible that these women are being drugged before their execution? There is a plan afoot that will mean destruction to the United States, a force attempting to disarm the United States, like that which led to Soviet Russia.'

"If these things were exceptional it would be better to be silent about them, but they are typical and becoming common and gross. If they provoked indignation and protest from within they might cure themselves, but no such protest gets into print . . . It is not merely the lack of sympathy with the cause of progress and international friendship, the patience with snobbery, the superciliousness and veneer which large-minded men and women in the patriotic societies have occasion to deplore, but a petty and obtuse chauvinism. The Boston papers some time ago reported a hearing at the State House on School Histories. The opposition of the Knights of Columbus and Sons of the Revolution to various text-books of high repute, by Hart, Muzzey and other accomplished scholars is noted; and Professor Hart came in from Harvard to show that it was no more sinful or dangerous to tell pupils that in their day men spoke ill of Washington and Jefferson than for them to learn at home that men spoke ill of Roosevelt and Wilson. What is the chief trouble? It is the com-

mon fear that these books do not let the pupils think badly enough of England. Irish Catholics and blue-bloods do not usually fraternise, but hatred of red-coats makes strange bed-fellows. All went well as long as the Revolution was viewed as a struggle between a united America of 'patriots' and a united England of tyrants; but it does not go so well when one-third of our people were not 'patriots' and most of the best English men were on our side.

'It is good to be debtors to the past; but it is good only as it makes us creditors of the future. One of Napoleon's young marshals, who had risen quickly from the ranks, was so snubbed in the 'good society' which took him up—scions of the faded aristocracy of the old régime—that in a moment of flashing resentment at dinner, he shivered his glass on the table and exclaimed, 'Gentlemen, I would have you understand that you are simply descendants, I am an ancestor.' The main thing for all of us blue-bloods, red-bloods, descendants, and other 'folks is somehow to become ancestors of something that this struggling world waits and prays for. These people who revile 'radicals,' that is, men like William Brewster, Roger Williams, Thomas Jefferson, and Charles Sumner, never revile reactionaries. [The tongues so glib against 'pacifists' never deviate into talk of 'militarists'; against peace people, never against war people.

"We do not want too many celebrations of the *Mayflower* men and the men of 1776 by men who do not know their spirit; who, had they lived in England in the time of the Pilgrims, would have said 'they got what they deserved' when they were harried out; who in the Boston of Sam Adams would have counted the 'father of the Revolution' a ring leader of demagogues and the consort of hoodlums; and when Garrison and Phillips were the victims of 'mobs' of gentlemen would have white-washed the mob.

"It is a shocking thing to the man who knows our history, who know the principles and prophecies of the founders of the Republic and the price they paid, to see great bodies of men and women . . . construing their office pettily, according to the letter, not according to the spirit. I would not be misunderstood. I revere history and our great past; I value genealogy; memorials are sacraments and provincialism is precious. But heraldry and monuments are not the principal thing, and the mind that makes them so is not robust. . . . There is no virtue in being slaves of a 'legendary virtue carved upon our fathers' graves.' Elijah prayed that God would take away his life because he was not 'better than his fathers.' If, with all the light and training, to-day is not better than yesterday, then it is not so good.

“The great cause here in 1776 was the independence of America and then the union of the states. The great cause of 1861 was the saving of the Union and the ending of slavery. The great cause to-day is the ending of war, and the peace of the world. Washington was called to organise a nation. We are called on to organise the family of nations; and the choice between the darkness and the light on that supreme issue will determine the place of every man of us in history.”

To save our bodies from disease we must study the construction of the body and its management. To save the world from destruction we must study the structure of the body politic. It behooves not only legislators, but every patriotic citizen, to know somewhat of such technical matters as courts and treaties and the technique of world organisation.

CHAPTER X

ARBITRATION, HAGUE COURTS AND CONFERENCES

Hugo Grotius said, in his great work, "The Rights of War and Peace": "It will be useful and almost necessary, that certain congresses of Christian powers should be held in which controversies which arise among some of them may be decided by others who are not interested, and in which measures may be taken to compel the parties to acceptance on equitable terms." Our Ambassador, Andrew D. White, said: "The germ of arbitration was planted in modern thought when Grotius in his '*De Jure Belli Ac Pacis*' urged arbitration and mediation as preventing war and wrote these solemn words, 'especially are Christian kings and statesmen bound to try this way of avoiding war.' Of all works not claiming divine inspiration that book, by a man proscribed and hated both for his politics and his religion, has proved the greatest blessing to mankind: more than any other it has prevented unmerited suffering, misery, and sorrow."

The first practical project for arbitration in
[172]

America was framed by Samuel Adams for the Legislature of Massachusetts as instruction to its delegates in Congress:

"You are hereby instructed and urged to move in Congress assembled to take into their deep consideration, whether any measures can by them be used that national differences may be settled and determined without the necessity of war." One great glory of Washington's administration was the Jay treaty out of which came several arbitrations. No one was satisfied with the treaty, but Washington said it was our business to accept it as negotiated by Chief Justice Jay.

From the time when John Jay put an arbitration clause into our treaty with England in 1794, there were until 1904, 540 arbitrations between different nations.* The most notable as concerns ourselves was the settlement of the *Alabama* case between the United States and England, in consequence of which England paid us damages for the destruction wrought by the ship *Alabama* built in England which ravaged our Union shipping during the Civil War. This outcome of the arbitration made a tremendous impression throughout the world.

In 1897 a treaty of arbitration arranged between the United States under President Cleveland and Great Britain, was defeated by a minority of the

* In 1928 there are in force 319 bilateral pacific settlement treaties.

Senate. A few Senators whose combined constituents amounted in number to less than the population of Chicago succeeded in preventing the necessary two-thirds vote, thereby thwarting the will of the people of two nations. Extraneous questions like those of Home Rule, which agitated the Irish element in America, helped toward the defeat which was a world calamity. Had we ratified this treaty, for which nearly 1,300,000 petitioned Parliament, the results would have been far-reaching. The minority report in our Senate illustrates the extremes to which false patriotism, conceit, and folly can carry men who have grave responsibility for the lives of men. It says: "We will be purblind if we relax our attitude and accept a paper guarantee of peace in place of the moral and military forces that are the supreme elements of strength in our splendid Republic. . . . Treaties are essentially temporary expedients, and in fact seem made to be broken, as fortresses are said to be made to be taken; and it is a question whether an open field and the chance of a fair fight are not the best protection to a peace-loving nation, both in war and in diplomacy."

In August, 1898, like a bolt from the blue, came the Czar's rescript calling a conference of the twenty-six nations having ambassadors at his court to consider the limitation of armaments. The call was

received with coldness and scepticism in many quarters. "The Czar's proposal for disarmament goes against nature and against civilisation; this alone condemns it," wrote one German editor. "The Czar's advocacy of peace is perhaps a stimulus to war," wrote another. "Disarmament would make wars more frequent," wrote Dr. E. von Hartmann, "Peace will never be better assured than by a thoroughly drilled army ready for instant service," quoth the Kaiser a month later. But in England there was hope, and, week by week, a new journal entitled *War Against War*, edited by William T. Stead, went broadcast through the English-speaking world, showing in each number a map covered with black dots marking the English towns where peace meetings had in the previous week been held. Arguments, statistics, and illustrations from Jean de Bloch's powerful new work were cited to show the great opportunity about to be opened to civilisation at The Hague.

The little neutral country of Holland was selected as presenting the best kind of meeting-place for such diverse elements, and the offer of the Queen's "House in the Wood" as a place of assembly was accepted. On the Czar's birthday, May 18, 1899, one hundred appointed delegates with their attachés held a brief first session in the circular hall, decorated on all sides by great frescoes of war and peace;

by courtesy, Baroness von Suttner, whose book "Down with Your Arms" had had wide influence, was the sole lady admitted. Ambassador de Staal of Russia was elected president; and thereafter, with the press excluded, the work was carried on behind closed doors. De Bloch, of Russia, the great authority on militarism, arrived, presented his "Future of War" in six volumes to each delegate, gave dinners, and lectured with stereopticon on the futility of modern war. Peace workers from every land assembled and shared in the tense excitement as, bit by bit, the news of progress leaked out from behind the closed doors. Mr. Stead, fresh from a visit to the Czar, was of great service here.

The members of the Conference, meeting for the most part in scepticism, soon found themselves under the inspiration of Lord Pauncefote, our Ambassador Andrew D. White, Bourgeois of France, Nigra of Italy, and a few others, men of courage and vision, working diligently in three committees from morning to night, forming friendships as they lunched together and together attended social functions. At one period during the Conference German indifference and even hostility seemed about to wreck it. In this exigency, Dr. White commissioned Frederick W. Holls of our American delegation, a prominent member of the New York bar, to carry a letter to Minister von Bülow. In this letter he made a noble

and powerful plea for the principle of arbitration and showed what wrong the Kaiser's ministers would do if they should permit him, a "ruler of such noble ambitions and admirable powers," to draw upon himself the resentment of the world through frustrating progress at the Conference. Mr. Holls carried with him manifold evidences of American enthusiasm for arbitration—among others a cable message from thirty-one Baptist clergymen in Oregon and a prayer written by the Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Texas, to be used every Sunday during the session of the Conference. Chancellor Hohenlohe, though a Roman Catholic, was especially affected by reading a copy of this prayer. The letter of Mr. White was presented to the Kaiser with friendly recommendations from these statesmen; and Count Münster, head of the German delegation, had sent Dr. Zorn to Berlin on a similar mission; indifference gave way to co-operation and hostility ceased.

The diaries of Dr. White and the Baroness von Suttner reflect vividly the stress and strain of the momentous experience until, after necessary compromises and the reservation by the Americans that nothing agreed to involved any abandonment of the traditional attitude of the United States towards questions purely American, the conventions at last were signed and sealed. The problem proposed by

the Czar of lessening the burden of armaments had not been solved, but a logical precedent condition for the reduction of armaments had been decreed. The Permanent Court of International Arbitration, with a panel of judges appointed by the signatory powers, was now assured. More had been accomplished for world organisation in three months than in the previous three centuries. Mankind entered the new century with the rational hope that, ere it ended, duels between nations would be as obsolete as are to-day duels between men in all English-speaking countries.

After the ratification of the conventions and the opening at The Hague, in April, 1901, of the mansion which was to be the temporary headquarters of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, scepticism again prevailed. "You have got your court, but no one has used it, and no one will use it except for trifling issues," was the cry. But in much less time than it took the Supreme Court of the United States to receive its first case, that Court having met and adjourned repeatedly for over two years without receiving a contested case, President Roosevelt, acting on the suggestion of Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, then on a visit to the United States, arranged with President Díaz to send to the Tribunal a long-standing case, involving money, known as

the "Pious Fund Case." According to the Hague Convention each country selected two judges from the large panel of judges and these four selected a fifth to try the case. This was soon settled in favour of the United States.

President Roosevelt in sending the first case to the Hague Tribunal, a small case, did it without much reference to the Senate. After France and Great Britain had signed an arbitration treaty in 1904, Secretary John Hay attempted to negotiate treaties in 1905 which, in the words of President Roosevelt, "should be with all powers which are willing to enter into treaties with us." Following the proviso of the Anglo-French treaty of 1903 exception was made of matters of vital interest and national honour. The *compromis*, which is a purely technical matter and belongs to the routine business of the Department of State which knows far more than the Foreign Relations committee, was a matter of suspicion on the part of the Senate; the latter developed the idea that the *compromis* must receive the advice and consent of the Senate. Despite the opposition of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hay, the Senate had its way, and the treaty was defeated. Elihu Root, following Secretary Hay, in the State Department, negotiated twenty-five treaties three years later with the hampering condi-

tions demanded by the Senate. These were mostly for a five-year period. All were renewed once and a dozen are still in force.

In 1911, President Taft secured the acceptance by Great Britain and France of arbitration treaties, and he practically went on the stump to secure popular approval. He declared: "We cannot make omelets without breaking eggs; we cannot submit international questions to arbitration without the prospect of losing . . . I am willing to abide an adverse decision in a court of arbitration for my own country, even though it may impose a serious loss upon her, if the system of arbitration is to be made permanent and the court is of such a character that when I have a just cause I can count on receiving a just judgment. If we are going into the arbitration game we must take our hard knocks with equanimity as we expect others to take theirs, with the knowledge that the disadvantages that may accrue to each party can never equal the horrible losses of war." The extraordinary outburst of enthusiasm with which the proposal for the treaty was hailed in Great Britain revealed the immense interest taken by the highest dignitaries of Church and State as well as by the rank and file of Englishmen in prospect of a noble culmination to the hundred years of peace between Great Britain and the United States. A campaign of six months was begun in the United States

on the report of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate which raised technical objections and would have emasculated the treaties. Never was the Senate so besieged by petitions and letters from boards of trade, churches, and all kinds of organisations in favour of these treaties. Germany seemed ready to sign a similar treaty, and it was evident that if these treaties were accepted without amendment it would probably be possible to secure similar ones within ten years with many other nations. By the casting of one vote, the treaties were weakened in dignity and proper form. The result was due to a division on party lines. Had not partisanship been rife, owing to high feeling incident to a presidential election, this second calamity might have been avoided. It is well for voters to realise the difficulties of our State Department in dealing with the Senate on international affairs, about which some of the Senators are always inexperienced and suspicious. The election of one prejudiced and unfit person may profoundly affect the future of our own and other countries, as our Constitution makes it possible for thirty-three men in the Senate to thwart the will of sixty-three Senators and, incidentally, the will of the American people.

In 1913 Secretary Bryan submitted a proposal to thirty-six nations which asked that disputed facts be submitted to impartial inquiry before nations

went to war. All accepted it in principle. Thirty treaties were negotiated to continue in force until notice of an intention to terminate it had been given. An important feature of the treaties is that the five members of the commissions to investigate should be chosen at the start and thus obviate delay when an issue arose. Twenty-one of these treaties are now in force; their chief value is that they may modify the attitude of governments in the daily differences that arise between them. The other nine treaties were not ratified. No offer of such a treaty was made to Japan. Colonel House broached the subject to the Kaiser who replied in flamboyant fashion, although his government had accepted such a treaty in principle. In September, 1914, negotiations were offered, but at that time the German government was busy with other matters. Had that treaty been signed we might have had to wait a year in 1917 for investigation before entering the war, and the history of the future would probably have recorded a negotiated treaty between the Allies and Germany before the *débâcle* at Caporetto that summer of 1917.

The first treaty after the war, covering the arbitration of all disputes, was signed by the Moslem states of Afghanistan and Persia. This says that they "have decided to submit to arbitration all the difficulties arising between the two countries and

ARBITRATION, HAGUE COURTS AND CONFERENCES

undertake loyally to carry out the decisions of the arbitrators." This was signed in 1921. From 1828-1926 there were 110 bipartite arbitration treaties, pledging the pacific settlement of all disputes, signed between different nations, some of whom are the larger powers. The United States has never signed such a treaty. France has five such treaties with other nations and, as has been said, offered such a treaty to the United States in 1927.

To this brief glance at the general course of arbitration may be added a still briefer one regarding what has been accomplished in Latin America. It is to Simón Bolívar, the Washington of South America, that five nations owe their freedom from the thralldom of Spain. A statesman of the broadest views, in the second decade of the last century he arranged five treaties with as many nations in which there was provision for arbitration of differences arising between them. He called the first Pan-American Peace Congress in 1826, at which the four nations that attended pledged themselves to "amicably compromise all differences now existing or which may arise in the future." Though these pledges were not ratified, their influence was later evident in the many treaties which provided for arbitration. In the constitution of Brazil it is decreed that no territory shall ever be taken by conquest.

In 1900 Chile and Argentina were on the point of

war over a boundary line. On an Easter Sunday a good bishop of Argentina pleaded with his people not to disgrace their common religion and common blood by fratricidal war. A Chilian bishop followed his example and they travelled through their respective countries imploring arbitration instead of war. Better counsels prevailed. The question was submitted to the King of England and the decision was rendered in 1902, but before its announcement agreement had been made for limitation of armaments. In 1903 Argentina and Chile signed the first arbitration treaty that covered all cases. A colossal statue of the Christ was taken up 13,000 feet, beyond the highest point where the railroads crossed the Andes, and there, on a lofty pedestal, was unveiled before thousands who had made the ascent to witness the moving spectacle. Beneath the outstretched hand extended over the borderline, where might have stood frowning fortresses, were read these words: "Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust, than Argentines and Chilians break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ, the Redeemer."

This short survey records only a part of the work that for a century has begun to show that war is a product of confused thinking and impetuous action, and that its extinction involves no change of human nature, but merely complete arbitration treaties and

their observance. It is a fact of extraordinary historic interest that in no instance has a nation that pledged itself to arbitrate broken its pledge and gone to war. In one instance there was a compromise, and, in another, mediation prevented war. If nothing more had been accomplished that cold, wet summer at The Hague than four months' patient, courteous discussion of the delicate and difficult questions involved, by the weary men who met daily and did their work under great difficulties of language, it would have been richly worth while.

At the second Hague Conference, in 1907, plenary sessions were open to the representatives of the press and to others fortunate enough to secure tickets of admission; but the chief work was done in committees. Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, directed our representatives to propose in addition to the Arbitration Court whose use was optional, a regular Court of Justice for the nations which should pledge themselves to its use. The proposal failed for reasons presently to be stated. The first Conference had crystallised ideas of international law; the second studied further international problems.

The primary difficulty in regard to setting up a Court of Justice was the necessity of having few members. How were these to be elected? No method could be found that would give the small states the certainty that they could equal the power-

ful states in the selection of judges. The speaker for Brazil, who was the mouthpiece of the smaller states, said that his country, whose area was greater than that of the United States, had then only 26,000,000 inhabitants, but in a century it might have 100,000,000, and be more powerful than many of those governments that were dominant to-day. It could not sanction any method of choice that did injustice to the smaller states. In addition to this, Germany refused to pledge herself to compulsory use of a Court. Could the matter have been carried through as it was outlined in the mind of Mr. Root, the World War could have been prevented.

The Hague Court of Arbitration has been housed in the Peace Palace at The Hague, the gift of Andrew Carnegie, embellished by rich donations of works of art from the member nations of the Conference. Japan sent marvellous tapestries, Great Britain provided stained glass, Germany, the iron fence, etc. The Permanent Court of International Justice, established by a Statute signed by 53 members of the League of Nations, opened in 1922 and meets regularly in the Peace Palace. This Court is largely the product of the mind of Elihu Root, whose first proposal in 1907 came to naught but was practically provided for in the League Covenant as a most desirable measure after the tragedy of war had begun to teach its lesson. In the summer of 1920 Mr.

ARBITRATION, HAGUE COURTS AND CONFERENCES

Root was invited to join the jurists appointed by the League, who met at The Hague and drew up the Protocol of Signature and the Statute of the Court, which, with some modifications by the League, was accepted by them, and the treaty was sent out to the states for ratification. The judges were elected in September, 1921, by the Assembly and Council of the League voting separately. A very wise provision of the Statute was that the eleven judges and four deputy-judges should be nominated by the panel of judges of the old Hague Court of Arbitration, as these include many of the ablest jurists of the world, and thus the little nations would have equal opportunity with these stronger ones in selecting the nominees. The jurists on the panel could have no political ambition or influence. Nominations are sent to the Assembly of the League which includes all members and also to the Council, the small executive body. The term of office is nine years. Among those sitting in this august body was America's eminent jurist, John Bassett Moore. The fourteen other members come from large and small nations all over the globe, familiar with different forms of law. No one represents his own country. His salary comes from the League, but his loyalty is given to the Statute. Provision was made for an "optional" agreement, which has been signed by about half the 53 signers of the Statute. This

pledges them to accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the Court in certain specified cases. Germany, in 1927, signed the agreement. The signers, as a whole, were not willing to accept the jurists' proposal that the Court should be compulsory for all signers. But gradually as confidence grows, doubtless all signatories, and these now include some of the most important governments, will accept compulsory arbitration. Suspicion was rife at first that the judges would be influenced in their decisions by national prejudice or favouritism. This suspicion has now largely vanished since the judge born in France, in an issue in which his country was involved, voted against its claim. There is no more reason for fear that these judges will be influenced by prejudice in favour of the countries in which they were born than that our own Supreme Court Justices will be influenced in favour of the states from which they come. Who has ever objected that having two Justices from Massachusetts has militated against impartial justice?

In 1924 the delegates at Geneva accepted a much more comprehensive protocol than the Covenant of the League of Nations. This Geneva Protocol included compulsory use of the Court. The basic thing in this Protocol was the branding of aggressive war as an international crime. The difficult question as to what shall be considered aggression was

settled. Following suggestions from certain eminent Americans, refusal to resort to pacific settlement in violation of the undertakings contained in the Covenant and the Protocol, was declared to be aggression. Both sides to a conflict might be considered aggressors. If the Council could not agree as to which was the aggressor, it should establish an armistice. Any nation that broke that or refused to accept the judgment of the Court, could be declared an aggressor. This simplified the whole problem, as previously the decision as to which force first crossed the boundary line or engaged in anything that could generally be accepted as aggression, involved much delay in investigation and in violent difference of opinion, each nation always claiming that it was engaged in defence. The Geneva Protocol, which was an amplification of the Covenant, marked the most advanced proposals ever considered for world peace. But though signed by the Fifth Assembly, and arousing much enthusiasm, it has not yet been ratified by many of the governments and is not in force. Compulsory arbitration and other features of the Protocol are certain in time to be resurrected and adopted. America's absence from the League in a measure prevented ratification by the British government.

The Permanent Court of International Justice (World Court) gives advisory opinions as well as

definite verdicts. This question of advisory opinions is deemed of great importance by the members of the League of Nations as it helps them to see the bearing of technical and legal points on political issues in question, and enables them in advance to avoid mistakes. For years, many Americans who were not ready for the entrance of the United States into the League, were desirous of its entering the Court as this was a comparatively slight step toward co-operation. Entrance would not pledge us ever to send an issue to the Court, unless we signed the optional clause to do so. On the other hand, non-members can resort to it even though they do not sign the Statute. But our entrance was defeated by one of the reservations which the Senate finally appended to its acceptance which was made in January, 1926, by a vote of 76 to 17. This whole matter was under consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee long before it was submitted to the Senate, and it was four years after the Court was established before our action was taken. The crucial reservation was part of the fifth and practically demanded special privileges. It said: "The Court shall not without the consent of the United States entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has or claims an interest."

The Secretary General of the League called to-

gether the delegates from the states signatory to the Statute of the Court to consider our reservations and asked that we send a representative to explain it. This our government declined to do. The delegates considered the matter for three weeks, with earnest endeavour to agree on a solution of the difficulty about advisory opinions without embarrassing the states already committed to the provisions of the Statute. They proposed a supplementary agreement which proposal failed to persuade our government, and over this slight issue the matter came to an end to the chagrin of millions of Americans. Despite the fact that one of the reservations provided for our withdrawal from the Court "at any time," eloquent Senators proclaimed that our entrance into the Court would create "entangling alliances" and would defy the principles laid down by Washington and Jefferson, which sophistry was credulously received by the great multitudes of the uninformed. The final act of the Conference is now in the files of the State Department. It would seem that there is no valid reason why conversations should not be reopened regarding it.

CHAPTER XI

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Four years after the League of Nations was established, a prominent civic worker in New York had heard so little of it that he remarked to some one going to the headquarters of the League, "I suppose that by this time you have a regular secretary who remains the year around." So little did he realise that at that moment at the Secretariat at Geneva there were 300 men and women from thirty-four nationalities, besides the 317 from twenty-eight nationalities in the adjacent International Labor Bureau, connected with the League. In all, 272 Americans have served in some capacity in the League's activities and that of the Labor Bureau. Among well-known Americans have been Professor Manley O. Hudson, Bishop Charles H. Brent, Jeremiah Smith, Jr., Thomas S. Adams, Roland W. Boyden, Allen W. Dulles, and among the women: Dr. Alice Hamilton, Julia Lathrop and Grace Abbott. The 465 persons now in the Secretariat include, besides a large clerical force, economists, geographers, translators, historians, and ex-

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

perts of various kinds dealing with different departments of world business in this great clearing-house of nations. These persons do not represent their own countries but simply serve the League.

What has the League thus far achieved? The first years of the League resulted in a large amount of agreement upon questions of importance that should have been settled long before, but which for lack of proper political machinery had not been attended to. These matters being settled, the League was willing to approach more difficult questions. The League exists as it declares, "to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security." The Assembly is composed of three representatives from each of fifty-five nations; the Executive body, the Council, has one representative each from five permanent members and nine non-permanent; the latter are for a term of three years, one-third of the number coming up for election annually. The Council can act only by unanimous vote. When matters are considered in the Council affecting states not members of that body, the interested state sends a representative. At one session nine other states had representatives. The fiftieth session of the Council will occur in the summer of 1928.

The International Labor Bureau, housed in a capacious new building near the Secretariat on the

shores of Lake Geneva, has great capacity for usefulness to all the toilers on the globe. Its alleviation of conditions of labour in India and elsewhere has been notable. Women and children who have been beasts of burden and have toiled ten to sixteen hours a day in factories have cause to bless the Bureau, though its work has only just begun. Of the 139 conferences held since 1920 under the auspices of the League, the most notable are: The International Financial Conference of 1920 at Brussels; the Lausanne Conference which dealt with the Turkish situation and removed the extra-territoriality rights of the Allies; and the International Opium Conference held in 1925, which considered suppression of smoking and limitation of manufacture and production. The Locarno Conference of 1925 is closely linked with League activities, and was an event of world-wide importance, and practically ensured peace between nations on both sides of the Rhine. A preliminary Conference on Disarmament and an Economic Conference were held in 1927.

The League has established registration of all treaties made by its members with any nations either in or out of the League; only registered treaties are binding; this prevents dangerous secrecy, such as has so often in the past left nations helpless in the hands of diplomats, and forced innocent peoples into a war not of their choosing. Upwards of 1,000

treaties are now registered at the Secretariat and open to the public.

League members are pledged to pacific settlement of disputes either by some form of arbitration, conciliation, judicial settlement or reference to the Council, and no loophole is left for possible use of force when an aggressor decides to abide by the verdict and nine months have elapsed after the submission of the case. Even then, in such a remote contingency if the aggressor will not yield, use of military force would not occur until mild, and later drastic, economic pressure was used. No nation would dare stand out against the world. The League has settled the following disputes:

1. One between Finland and Sweden concerning the Aaland Islands which left them under Finnish sovereignty, neutralised and non-fortified, and with the Swedish language preserved to the inhabitants.

2. One between Poland and Lithuania, a very complex and difficult matter, still unsettled but the League prevented war.

3. A dispute over Upper Silesia, involving rights of Germans and Poles finally settled in the longest treaty ever made which provides for the administration of Upper Silesia as an economic whole for fifteen years.

4. Dispute between Jugo-Slavia and Albania, both members of the League; there was no blood-

shed, though Jugo-Slav troops entered Albania disputing the question of boundary line. For such hasty, improper action Jugo-Slavia found she could borrow no money from any European bankers, and she was obliged to withdraw.

5. Settlement of frontier questions involving Greece, Rumania, Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

6. The outbreak between Italy and Greece, due to certain Greeks having murdered certain Italian officials, and the hasty action of Italy in a reprisal attack on the island of Corfu, in which about twenty refugee children were killed. The League instantly called a halt; all small nations were intensely concerned. Italy voluntarily paid 10,000,000 lire to the families affected; a settlement by the council of ambassadors in Paris was followed by the payment of damages by Greece to Italy and the painful episode which shocked the world ended without war, largely through energetic action by the League.

7. There has been settlement of the Memel difficulties; consideration of eastern Carelia which involved Russia; settlement of frontier between Poland and Czechoslovakia; of the minority question in Greece; settlement of the Iraq frontier and the controversy between Turkey and Great Britain over the Mosul region in Iraq. This was a serious and complicated matter, which resulted in a treaty

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

between Great Britain and Iraq. Turkey received a percentage of Mosul oil and some rectification of her boundary.

8. The League called immediate halt to raids of Greek troops into Bulgaria in the autumn of 1925 on the appeal of Bulgaria, and at once sent an impartial commission to investigate which, on inquiry, showed Greece to be responsible. She was compelled to pay \$224,000 damages, though her treasury could ill afford it.

9. Establishment of the Permanent Court of International Justice (World Court) based on a statute signed thus far by 53 nations. Elihu Root, as has already been shown, had a large share in the drawing up of this statute. The Court has had annual sessions since it was opened in 1922. Besides ten regular decisions, it has given thirteen advisory opinions which are of equal consequence. The League has no more domination over the Court than our Congress has over our Supreme Court.

10. The League accomplished the financial reconstruction of poverty-stricken Austria and Hungary, with the assistance of American financial experts and an international loan.

11. Development of deserted Macedonian plains by aid to 500,000 refugees, who are now by their labour adding to the wealth of Greece.

12. The League brought back 400,000 starving

refugee soldiers from Russia to their respective countries and to families who had not seen them for four years.

13. The League has had commissions working on armaments, private manufacture of them, chemical and bacteriological warfare, and preliminary sessions have been held for a later Disarmament Conference. The Permanent Mandates Commission hears reports from mandatory governments over different grades of backward peoples in Asia and Africa; the Mandatories are obliged to follow directions of the League and are held responsible for their actions. This plan, however defective, has prevented confiscation of territory and irresponsible administration.

14. The League has established commissions and the holding of conferences on the manufacture and traffic of opium and other drugs; on Health Organisation, including study of malaria, sleeping sickness, etc. It has established the Far Eastern Epidemiological Intelligence Bureau; a commission on Public Health training; on Quarantine of infected ships, etc.; committee and conference on White Slave Traffic; committee on Protection of Children; committee on Intellectual Co-operation with headquarters in Paris. This concerns itself, among other things, with the instruction of youth in the principles of the League. Almost every month in the

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

year several committees or conferences dealing with these and other international matters are being held at Geneva, creating, as nowhere else, an international feeling and impartial treatment of international issues. Out of such conferences will probably come, eventually, a common coinage and a common system of weights and measures.

This brief outline of some of the achievements of the League leaves the unimaginative, who have never breathed the League atmosphere and witnessed the assembling of delegates from the ends of the earth, incapable of conceiving its significance; he is like one who had never seen a being of flesh and blood and had beheld only its skeleton. As well teach the Constitution of the United States to a Persian or Siamese who had never been in America, and expect him to understand its application and the significance of the land of Jefferson and Lincoln, as to interest the average American in the League if he has nothing more than a catalogue of formulas and facts without a background of history and the power of sympathetic interpretation.

All unsympathetic and unimaginative minds look with suspicion on anything which binds them to a new procedure. Every one recalls that two states of our original thirteen were so suspicious in 1789 that they at first refused ratification of the Constitution. When Congress first met it had no quorum.

Ten amendments were at once added to satisfy the people. The Supreme Court, likewise under suspicion, met and adjourned for two years before it was trusted with the first contested case.

The League of Nations began under like suspicion. M. Clemenceau on being asked some months before the war ended what he thought of a League of Nations replied that he could not consider such a matter. He was a fighter, and a younger generation must deal with such problems. Even before a line of the Covenant of the League was written bitter protests against any League appeared in various American newspapers and elsewhere. The first draft of the Covenant was presented to us by President Wilson in February, 1919, and for three months this open covenant was subjected to scrutiny. Valuable suggestions made by leading Republicans, Mr. Root, Mr. Taft, Mr. Hughes, were incorporated and the second draft was much improved. Never was a covenant more "openly arrived at."

Yet it is surprising to recall the public ignorance of the contents of the Covenant in the partisan struggle which followed until the election of 1920. With the exception of a little discussion about Shantung, Senators gave slight attention to the complicated treaties of Versailles, St. Germain, Trianon, etc., which had certain drastic, vindictive features which have provoked bitterness and induced financial dis-

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

tress. They concentrated discussion on the Covenant, the most advanced step ever taken to provide a meeting-place of nations and a clearing house for international problems.

The primary cause for the failure of the ratification was the provision of our Constitution requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify a treaty, though it permits Congress to commit the country to war by a majority vote. It is important to remember that a large majority of the Senate desired to ratify the treaty with the Lodge reservations, and had they done so the people would have gladly acquiesced. When it came up for reconsideration it was lost by only one vote. Senator Newbury of Michigan said he thanked God that his one vote had kept us out of the League. In the Presidential campaign of 1920 orators galore, some of whom had hardly read the Covenant themselves, denounced it to audiences in which not one voter in a hundred had ever read it. Said one able and honest journalist, "I have a little kid at home and I don't want him to have to go to war and that's why I am against the League." "Have you ever read the Covenant?" he was asked, and he replied, "No, I never had a copy." Earnest women besought women voters to oppose the League since "it meant more war." Second-hand interpretations handed down by partisan propagandists to an uninformed

public, and the inflexible attitude of an invalid President resulted, after long contest, in what many now feel to have been a tragic political blunder.

Until 1922 the irreconcilables said: "The League is dead." Gradually, as the League has steadily been doing admirable work, they have deigned to recognise its existence. Business men are painfully realising that Europe's financial distress affects their commerce and is even now the cause of much unemployment.

Before the admission of Ireland into the League, there were loud outcries about Great Britain being "allowed six votes," as her constituent elements in the Commonwealth of Nations each had one vote in the Assembly, and if we entered we would have one there. It was assumed that Canada, Australia and the rest would be a unit and act together under the dictation of Downing Street. The facts are that in the Council of the League, which must act unanimously except on matters of procedure, the whole British Empire of 440,000,000 people have had only one vote,* and the Council is the body which is executive, while the Assembly chiefly engages in discussion and votes on only a few matters aside from the election of judges, and members of the Council. In the Assembly it is quite fair that Canada, and

* In September, 1927, Canada was elected as one of the temporary members of the Council.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

other dominions having five to ten million inhabitants, should each have a vote when much smaller states like Haiti and San Domingo have a voice. Ireland and other members of the British Dominions accept no domination from Downing Street and will stand in less awe of the mother country than Caribbean states under our domination would in regard to us.

A clerical writer, wrathfully critical of the League for permitting the domination of Great Britain over her Indian subjects, declared that: "The League which was organised ostensibly to promote justice and freedom made itself the guarantor and defender of the most stupendous example of political injustice and oppression known in our modern day. These 'Big Four' nations so framed the League as to make it *an additional chain about the necks* of India and all the rest of their possessions—a chain holding them in bondage actually more securely than before. This is what is meant that the League *guaranteed the territorial integrity* of the states within it." This is a sad misreading of Article X. Should India revolt, as is possible if she can ever unite her antagonistic and illiterate elements, she will find no obstacle in the League; no nation in the League would meddle in the rebellion one way or the other. A revolt against a suzerain would not be "external aggression." The League is not so constituted that

it can suppress civil war or internal revolutions. The wiser heads in Great Britain foresee the necessity of eventually granting to India all the independence that she desires. All Asia is demanding freedom from the thralldom of the white race. It is probable that when the weak and discordant elements in India become capable of effective revolt, it may be accomplished most effectively by the boycott and by refusal to do military service under the British flag. If that day comes, the League will make no effort to maintain British imperialism.

It has sometimes been claimed that over twenty wars have occurred since the League was founded, and the inference has been made that the League has encouraged rather than prevented war. The truth is that though Poland within the League fought Russia outside the League, and Greece, in the League, fought Turkey which is outside it, no nation in the League has had a war with another member. The wars that have been fought have been of the nature of domestic wars or the beginnings of a war promptly arrested.

The League spends annually about \$5,000,000—one-third of the cost of one new cruiser! Great Britain, the largest contributor, pays about \$425,000 and Albania pays the least amount—\$5,000. Under the Covenant, war is not yet outlawed. Reliance is placed chiefly on delay, investigation, and publicity.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Any nation like our own can attain security, whether in the League or out of it, by negotiating treaties, as Sweden, Switzerland, and many other nations have done, pledging the peaceful settlement of all disputes between itself and certain other states.

A California senator in a tirade against the Covenant of the League once declared, "This League means that American boys shall police the world; that Europe, Asia and Africa may draw upon us in every dispute and quarrel; that our nation may be at the mercy of European and Japanese diplomats. It means that we shall guarantee the territorial integrity of every country on the earth." This reminds one of the men whom Dante declared had "foregone the good of intellect." Here was an able and presumably honest man so blinded by partisan passion as to conjure up lurid pictures which had no reality outside his imagination and that of millions equally uninformed. He referred of course to the crucial Article X, which has been so grossly misunderstood by those who would emasculate the League and leave it incompetent in the last resort to stop aggressive war.

Stopping "external aggression" is literally what this article means when it says: "The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members

of the League. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

This advice is only for an extreme and unlikely contingency. Long before it could be used, two things would happen. It would be evident that some disturbance was brewing and some grudge existed. No war ever started suddenly between friends who had solemnly pledged themselves to arbitrate every dispute. It is the duty of each and every member of the League which sees trouble approaching to report to the Council for investigation. Such troubles will be numerous, not only among the Balkans but elsewhere. No member will be called on at first to rush in troops. If a member state does break its pledge and venture "external aggression," the first punishment will be withholding credit, sale of munitions, and if an aggressor will not yield, withholding supplies and intercourse. The different stages can be ordered instantly from the Council to all its members. Germany never suffered anything like a complete boycott. During the war she had supplies from Turkey, Bulgaria, Rumania, Switzerland, Holland, Norway, Denmark, and part of the time from Italy. Does any one imagine that she or any other great power is going to run the risk of not having a ship enter its port, or a railroad car cross its

border, or a telegram being delivered? of being ostracised and anathematised far more than Germany was for breaking Prussia's old pledge regarding Belgian neutrality? However, until the United States pledges herself not to take advantage of such a situation by providing supplies for an acknowledged aggressor, the League will be greatly hampered in making a boycott completely effective.

The senator assumed that rushing American troops across the sea would be the first, not the last, measure. He forgot that in no case could our troops go without the consent of our one member of the Council and the sanction of Congress so far as our own forces are concerned. Moreover, and this is the main consideration, the Covenant does not guarantee the boundaries existing when the treaty was signed shall remain forever in a growing, changing world. The framers of the Covenant were not so childish as to imagine that the whole process of history would be reversed and that boundaries existing now could be forever maintained. "Existing political independence" means, of course, that existing when the aggression is made, which may not be for fifty years hence when present boundaries and conditions may have been peaceably changed. Did not we change our boundaries peaceably by political authority when we added Florida and when we purchased the Louisiana territory and Alaska? Did

not Norway and Sweden peacefully separate? Have not scores of changes been made in governments and boundaries without "external aggression"? This has nothing to do with internal collisions or domestic revolt, such as might arise in India, or such as arose in China and Morocco. With civil war and internal disturbance, let it be reiterated, the League has nothing to do.

As to our being called "to police the world," the whole tendency of discussion is for regional agreements for security. When a person throws a match into a waste-basket and there is a blaze, no one rushes to the telephone and summons the fire-engines from neighbouring towns. The nearest person throws on a bucket of water. The nations of each continent should stand together to preserve the integrity of each. Each nation may secure safety as France has done through the Locarno compact as well as by each standing by all and all by each. Disputes in North and South America should be prevented by Pan-American agreements from ending in aggression. The notion that, in a possible fracas between Rumania and Hungary, for instance, Japan and Chile and the United States must mobilise troops and rush to the rescue, was never conceived by the sane men who wrote the Covenant; only perverseness and partisan excitement read it into the plain words of the Covenant.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The interpretation of the Constitution has filled law libraries. The interpretation of the Covenant awaits further development. It will be interpreted by the Permanent Court of International Justice, whose eleven judges and four deputy judges, chosen from different continents as the most expert and reliable jurists of the world, may be trusted to come as near the truth as fallible mortals can. The safeguards of the Covenant must be emphasised. Whereas no southern state could secede from the United States, which has in the Republic a super-state, any nation may withdraw from the League by giving two years' notice, as the League is not a super-state. What possible risk should we take now in entering the League, if we did so on condition that whatever changes we think needful should be accepted subject to our withdrawal? The prime consideration as regards peace is that all members pledge themselves to the nine-months "cooling-off" period during which they may have disputes arbitrated or investigated and reported on, and can use no force until the expiration of that period and, only then, if the nation against whom the verdict has gone refuses to abide by that verdict.

Here is a great section of the world taking the greatest step ever taken in all history toward the abolishment of war. The United States, as previously noted, has already twenty or more treaties,

the so-called Bryan treaties, for a similar cooling-off period. Why not extend this pledge to fifty-five nations, and lend them our strength in bringing in the nations still outside, thus achieving a genuine League of Nations that can outlaw war?

The achievements of the League seem all that could have been expected by an agency so sadly crippled at the start with the whole responsibility thrown on men dazed and exhausted with four years of war. The Assembly has met every September, growing in its eight sessions in experience, mutual understanding, and democratic character; the Council has met forty-nine times in various countries and dealt with exigencies and the most important matters. The suspicious have often claimed that the League is all right for the big problems of the Little Powers, and for the little problems of the Big Powers, but that once get two Big Powers really involved and it simply will not function. But the memorable meeting of the forty-fourth session of the Council in March, 1927, disproved that theory. The dispute over the Saar Valley, which had continued for seven years between France and Germany, had become magnified into a serious question of national prestige. The foreign ministers of the two countries met at Geneva and for three days argued, sought compromises, pled their public opinions in vain. They finally came to see that the only

chance for agreement was in a public debate, although this was dangerous and was a new attempt in diplomacy. The fourteen-nation members met with the German Foreign Minister Streseman, acting as President, who announced the first international debate in which Germany had the right to state her case in this important question. One hundred and five journalists were in attendance ready to send reports to the ends of the earth. What was involved was really the possibility of a break between the two major powers which since the Locarno compact had been coming together. Never before had a matter of prestige between two great powers been debated under such publicity. Yet it was done with good humour and wit, and the whole matter brought to a successful conclusion, each side making concessions which could never have been accomplished in a private session without being at once rejected at home. The world perceived, as Mr. Chamberlain stated, that the method offered an infinitely greater hope of success than the old process of constantly increasing irritation through the interchange of soulless telegrams. The Saar debate marked a milestone in the series of successful efforts to secure a peaceful settlement of difficulties.

It has been objected that the great imperialist powers have been made the permanent members of the Council, and that it is unjust to have them

dominate. But it is evident that there would be no justice in giving Denmark or Abyssinia equal power with France or Great Britain. In the long run strong and influential nations are bound to have weight in proportion to their power. Shall this power be uncurbed and used outside the League, leaving the outsiders free as in pre-war days to go to war when they please; or shall the powers in co-operation voluntarily submit to pledges and, hand in hand, control each other and insist on reason instead of slaughter in the settlement of their disputes? The powers will take no interest in any organisation that nullifies their own influence. The provision for a Council which can act only when all members agree, and for an Assembly in which the smallest nation can be heard and has equal weight with any other, guarantees, so far as now is possible, justice and safety to each little state, and puts permanent responsibility into the hands of the five most powerful states plus nine of the smaller states which rotate in office. The division of power obviates the difficulties which made the Hague Conferences much less effective. When the League is further developed, the requirement of unanimity for all action of the Council may yield to some qualification. At present unanimity of fourteen nations is not so difficult as when the rule applied to forty-four nations in the Hague Conference.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Said Elihu Root in 1926: "M. Briand very wisely said that in Europe there must be moral disarmament before there could be physical disarmament, and ever since he has been applying that sage philosophy to his own immortal glory and to the great benefit of all mankind. . . . When the League was completed, when we refused to become a member of it and Europe was left without the support of the most populous and richest and most potentially powerful nation whose name was written into the Covenant, what would any member have said to another who had been brought into such an untoward condition by his representative and agent, mistaken, but in good faith? What, but an expression of the most sincere regret . . . What did we do? We, the great peace-loving people, what have we done to help in this wonderful new work? No sympathy, no moral support, no brotherhood. Our executive department has done the best it could, but governments can do but little. It is the people, the power of the people behind the government, that means everything. We have allowed insensate prejudice, camouflaged by futile phrases, to appear, but falsely to appear, to represent the true heart of the American people."

The primary question for Americans to consider is, shall we choose fear, anarchic international relations, and possible world-war, or the beginnings of

order, system, and regular political machinery, for doing the world's necessary international business? Granted that existing political machinery is inadequate; the issue now is that which Alexander Hamilton faced in 1788—either the particular Constitution, with which he was by no means satisfied, or disintegration and chaos. He chose the courageous policy and urged our entrance upon the untried experiment as the better alternative. Now it is for sane men to begin and improve such a world's business agency as we now have, or to let malcontents encourage conditions that may defeat it and lead to an exterminating world war. The abnormal psychic attitude which existed in Europe previous to the great World War should be studied if we are to escape still worse disaster.

CHAPTER XII

BEFORE AND AFTER THE WORLD WAR

For ten years vast study has been given by scholars to research into the startling events, and the frantic letters and telegrams which passed between the heads of governments and diplomats, during the fateful weeks after the assassination of the Austrian archduke at Sarajevo. The first bewilderment and then the wholesale condemnation of Germany as the instigator of the war "for which she had been preparing for forty years" is giving way to a profounder analysis of a situation which at the time stunned the world beyond the power of sane thought. It is now obvious that any armaments or training of men forty years or thirty years or even fifteen years before the war, would have been of no account in a world in which new inventions make any weapon quickly obsolete. When the war came Germany's accumulation of armaments was used up in two months and, like her opponents, she struggled desperately to keep her munition makers at top-speed until the end.

Sharp differences still exist as to the proportion

of blame to be assigned to the original combatants, though the majority of scholars do not go so far as Professor Barnes in placing less blame on Germany than on France and Russia. Signor Nitti, the former Italian prime minister, however, declared that "Russia's attitude was the real and underlying cause of the world conflict." Baron Rosen, late Russian minister at Washington, wrote to E. D. Morel, the eminent London publicist, of English and French descent, that he agreed with the latter's view that "the legend of the German plot to impose domination over Europe is responsible for the vast punitive mechanism known as the treaty of Versailles, and further that this dogma of Germany's sole responsibility for the war is internationally what the Dreyfus case was nationally for the nation concerned." He said he subscribed "unreservedly to the views you entertain in regard to the nefarious character of the policies practised by the so-called statesmen of the leading nations of Europe during the decades which preceded the advent of the catastrophe." Surely nothing more nefarious has been put on record than the letter of Lord Fisher, Admiral of the British Fleet, proposing to King Edward in 1908, that "as it was Germany's set intention to make even England's mighty navy hesitate at sea, it seemed to me a sagacious act on England's part to

seize the German fleet when it was so very easy of accomplishment." * He wrote of a plan, several years before the war began, to land 100,000 troops on the Pomeranian shore. Another startling bit of information marked "Secret" was in a note by Lord Fisher in which he says, "Tirpitz asked a mutual friend living in Berlin to inquire very privately of me whether I would agree to limiting size of guns and size of ships, as this is *vital* to the Germans, who can't go bigger than the Dreadnoughts in guns of size." "I wrote back by return post," said he, "yesterday morning, 'Tell him I'll see him d—d first' (them's the very words). I wonder what Wilhelm will say to that, when Tirpitz shows him the letter." Fisher called attention to the statement of Admiral Mahan that "88 per cent of England's guns are aimed at Germany." In 1909 he rejoiced at Britain's "eighteen miles of ships—the most powerful in the world, and none of them more than ten years old." In 1911 he wrote, "I happen to know that the Germans are *in a blue funk of the British navy* and are quite assured that 942 German merchant steamers would be 'gobbled up' in the first forty-eight hours of war, and also the d—d cer-

* He had urged the King to "repeat Nelson's Copenhagen," and, as he later stated, he knew that the Germans had "a daily dread" of this very thing, which was a reason for their "feverish haste" in strengthening their navy.

tainty of *when* and *where* a hundred thousand troops embarked in transports and kept 'in the air' might land. N. B. *There's a lovely spot only ninety miles from Berlin.*" It is needless to say that the average Briton would have heartily condemned this, had he known of it.

In July, 1914, the momentous decisions, made hastily when all were madly struggling on the brink of an abyss, are not now our chief concern. In August, 1914, Lloyd George said in Queen's Hall: "What are we fighting for? To defeat the most dangerous conspiracy ever plotted against the liberty of nations; carefully, skilfully, insidiously, clandestinely plotted in every detail with ruthless, cynical determination." The consensus of opinion to-day as regards responsibility is now probably that of Lord George in December, 1920: "The more one reads memoirs and books written before the war the more one realises that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war at that stage. It was something into which they staggered and stumbled, perhaps through folly; and a discussion, I have no doubt would have averted it. . . . I can not say that Germany and her allies were solely responsible for the war which devastated Europe . . . that statement, which we all made during the war, was a weapon to be used at the time; now that the war is over, it

BEFORE AND AFTER THE WORLD WAR

cannot be used as a serious argument.” * A discussion might have averted it! Alas, no men of official position, foreseeing misunderstanding and consequent disaster, had done the one obvious thing which a foreign minister should do as soon as inducted into his responsible position—talk face to face with the men whose minds he could not fathom by letters and cablegrams and whom it was vitally important he should understand. It was common report that Sir Edward Grey did not speak German, had never been in Germany, and had only once crossed the Channel on a brief visit to France. When he had a vacation he loved the solitude of a fishing trip. What might have happened had he gone to Berlin and instituted an exchange of visits in which, every year, the men who held in their hands the life and death of millions had sat around a table and breakfasted together! Mr. Asquith in his work, “The Genesis of the War,” made the astounding statement regarding Baron Marshal von Bieberstein, the representative of Germany in London for some time before his death in 1912: “I am as satisfied as one can be of anything in the domain of

* Mr. Asquith and Lord Grey, who, with Mr. Lloyd George, were the responsible English statesmen at the outbreak of the war, have publicly declared in recent years that their view of German and European feeling in 1914 was mistaken, and that they do not believe that Germany then desired war. Lloyd George's words undoubtedly express their later opinion.

conjecture that if he had remained, there would have been no European war in 1914."

In the treaty of Versailles the central powers were held responsible for all the damage done; and insane demands for over one hundred thousand million dollars were made at first for reparations, which gradually diminished to about one-tenth that sum, and now are left indefinite.

What we need to know are the deep-lying causes, the false political theories, the gross misapprehensions of each other and of their own true interests, which the nations in the armed camp of Europe entertained. An exaggerated patriotism had developed a pathological condition and false psychology. It was the first general war since the establishment of conscription and the enrolment of the great majority of male citizens of fighting age. Previous wars had been like the Napoleonic wars and the war against Austria for Italian freedom. The war of 1914 began, as George P. Gooch has said, "in a period of nervous tension marked by the spirit of enterprise, speculation, hastiness, anxiety, but inspired by no ruling ideal." Men's nervous systems could not adjust themselves to the complicated and abnormal conditions of existence. The same tension exists to-day. How can the average man, not on fire with spiritual zeal and lofty thought, amid the hustling throngs in noisy streets darkened by day

BEFORE AND AFTER THE WORLD WAR

by monstrous skyscrapers, and ablaze at night with whirling, lurid figures that blot out the stars, focus thought on anything which is not material and immediate and distracting? The repose of mind necessary to think out complex problems of human relations is all but impossible in the obtrusive and dangerous conditions of our great cities, where, if one tries to think, every street crossing brings one nigh to death. What wonder that insanity, divorce, suicide have become matters of course and that legislators grapple in vain with stupendous problems which no education that was given them helps them to solve. A test of sanity is the possession of a sense of life being worth while, and the feeling of responsibility for one's own life and the common social life.

In a scholarly and penetrating book on "The Neuroses of Nations," * C. E. Playne of London has traced acutely the psychical conditions that superinduced the war. The historic, political, and economic conditions have been profoundly studied, but not equally the important psychological conditions which render so much of present life abnormal, the most abnormal feature of which is that it is not recognised as such. The continuance of civilisation depends quite as much on recognition of group-

* In a later book (1928) entitled "The Pre-War Mind in Britain" Miss Playne had applied the same principles used in her study of France and Germany, to England in that same period.

pathology as on the problems of raw materials and tariffs.

For decades before the war the descent to the abyss began; yet had there been brakes to hold back the cars of State, had a League of Nations existed to summon its Council at once after the affair at Sarajevo, the fatal plunge would not have come. One of the early portents of future trouble was the decline of intellectual life for two decades before the war; there were no Darwins, Carlyles, Brownings, Dickenses, George Eliots; no Mazzinis, Tolstois, Lincolns, Emersons, Pasteurs, Bismarcks, or Wagners. Literature, as compared with that of the sixties and seventies and eighties, was decadent. Reading was largely of magazines and newspapers, albeit there was a lessening of illiteracy and a wider spread of scientific knowledge. "A good time" was the goal of many minds. Thinkers and reformers were often considered "bores." Despite greater comfort, novelty, and richness of life, haunting dissatisfaction, scepticism, satiety, the lack of zest in life made many hungry for any tumult that would give spice to satiated, unjoyous lives. There was a lack of men of genius in all walks of life. The church lost much of its hold on the consciences of men, as by superficial minds it was assumed that science was undermining its main theses. Confused thinking and lack of aim prevented observance of

the danger signals. Excitement, rush, games on stupendous scale, decreasing homelife, restaurant and railroad existence, grew apace, and with it all tense nerves, no time for thought and consequent impoverishment of soul. Universal military training in Europe bred a regimented life, accustomed to irresponsible routine, and with inadequate initiative. The grim spirit of Prussian militarism was manifest in the harsh sculpture, devoid of any attempt at Grecian grace. Nothing uglier, or more portentous as a reflection of the dangerous spirit that was growing, could be found than the colossal war monument at Leipzig, erected a few years before the war. Pride, fear, national conceit in both France and Germany built up an ever higher wall of separation. Strenuous efforts were made by chauvinists to prevent the third Hague Conference scheduled for 1915.

The phrases, "the will to power," "politics of force," did not exist before 1910. But the worship of power antedates that. There was a swing back from German idealism to a crass materialism, which accompanied the transition of Germany from a simple agricultural to a thriving commercial and industrial life, but which, nevertheless, doomed myriads of workers to the dull routine of factory life. Among scholars, Professor Treitschke's deification of the blind power of the State was a far

cry from the conception of the State as an end existing for the general advance of culture and education. Bernhardt, though read but little in Germany, was read in half a million copies in England after the war broke out,—and there his soulless and preposterous theories were supposed to be typical of German thought. He, and a group of scholars, followed Treitschke who advanced the ideas of the really small group of rabid Pan-Germans. This brilliant professor of history at Berlin stamped his ideas on successive classes of students destined to be influential. Said C. E. Playne:

“It was a Satanic vision which he pursued. And he pursued it like many of his followers and the Pan-Germans, with perfect uprightness of heart. This was their obliquity, their falling away, their mental trouble. The conception of might, as an end in itself, as an ideal the nation should strive for, was the very opposite to the pure humanism which constituted the ideal of the great German thinkers of the saner period of Kant and Goethe. It was the crowd of his followers who proclaimed his inverted standard, so obsessed were they with the strained and hardened views which Treitschke enunciated. The regimentation of Germany lessened the sense of responsibility. The mechanical training of men as conscripts diminished the sense of value of organic life. Those neuroses

BEFORE AND AFTER THE WORLD WAR

which rush to fill up spiritual voids took possession of whole groups and may be said to have affected the whole national mind."

They exalted power; obedience became the supreme virtue. Militarism was only one manifestation of the idea of the supreme importance of physical and mechanical means of compulsion. The "will to power" obsession blinded Germany more than any other nation in the pre-war period.

In "The Guilt of William Hohenzollern," Professor Friedjung in a study of imperialism between 1887-1914 asserts that "the flood of imperialism extending from England gradually sucked in the other great nations, including North America, and finally overwhelmed nearly the whole of humanity, leaving death and destruction in its wake." In one generation Great Britain had taken over the control of enormous areas of Africa and Asia, and now rules over 45,000,000 people in Africa, and in the whole world over 440,000,000 people, that is, fifteen million more than one-quarter of the inhabitants of the globe. Nationalism should lead to internationalism, not to imperialism. Its present nature has been demonstrated in the relations of the European powers in Asia, and the evidence that Asia is now in steadily growing revolt. It was the British control

of India that led to the keeping of the Turk in power for fifty years at the Dardanelles so as to prevent Russia getting control there and perhaps threatening England's free access to the Suez canal. The British government failed to perceive how a generous policy and safe-guarding treaties might have prevented the ominous pressure, and, by giving Russia what she had a natural right to—access at all times to a warm water port—have drawn off the poison and relieved Europe from constant fear and tension. How long would the United States have kept within bounds if it had been shut off from the Pacific by the width of Washington, Oregon and California, and from the Atlantic by as wide an area in the east, and had no outlet except through Hudson Bay, frozen over half the year? John A. Hobson, the eminent English economist, closed his profound study of "Imperialism" with these words which are as pertinent to our country as to his own: "Imperialism is a depraved choice of national life, imposed by self-seeking interests . . . It is the besetting sin of all successful States and its penalty is unalterable in the order of nature." This penalty is the preponderance of wealth in the hands of a few and wars with backward people.

The lust for empire and the mistaken notion of its advantages except to a favoured few was one of the deep-lying causes of the World War. The

growth of the system of capitalism, which requires foreign markets, has a profound relation to militarism and war. If the full value of products were distributed to all producers, including the highly competent and highly salaried brains of every concern, so that all producers might receive in proportion to their production, and with no excessive profit to the invested capital, would not the producers' increased purchasing power consume the surplus which now the profit system compels proprietors to scramble for in markets overseas? Failure to distribute justly and rationally to producers means poverty, slums, congestion in home cities, and desperate efforts to go far afield for customers. If the millions of poor whites in the Appalachians, and the millions in sordid tenements in Liverpool and London, were able to buy as much as they can produce, which a proper readjustment would enable them to do, there would be few millionaires and fewer wars, and superior brains and organising ability could have a due reward.

British imperialism was one of the causes of the World War, as well as the Russian ambition for a warm water port, as to which Iswolsky, six months before war opened, said that it was the historic mission of Russia to take possession of the Straits. The Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was another serious factor in breeding war. Aus-

tria's unwarrantable ultimatum to Serbia, which was the immediate cause of the war, had, however, more basis than at first appeared. We know now that the assassination of the heir to the throne of Austria by a native of the turbulent country in which only a few years before regicides had shocked the world with their assassinations of the Serbian king and queen, was not merely the individual act of a fanatic youth, but a result of deliberate plot of a great group, of which men high in the government had some cognisance.

There is an enormous mass of evidence in the drama, art exhibits, novels, and newspapers of the period both in Germany and France, as well as in other countries, which reveals the growing tenseness of the attitude of each toward the other. Clever French writers promoted the spirit of revenge, while German writers fostered the fear that Germany was being surrounded by a ring of enemies. Everywhere there was a conspicuous lack of sound political philosophy and a sane spirit of co-operation.

All the world knows of German chauvinism; but when during the war all cables were cut, and America received news only through a British censorship, no emphasis was laid on the neurasthenia which prevailed in France before the war and which created a similar attitude of mind to that in the central countries. As an offset to bitter words of

Poincaré at the dedication of a monument to the war dead, the words of E. D. Morel, the English scholar, should be cited.

Born of a French father and English mother, E. D. Morel in England was one of the few who tried to preserve a judicial attitude of mind, and in his "Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy" and in his earlier magnificent work in driving the despotism of the Belgium King, Leopold, from the Congo, he showed an accuracy and love of truth, which made him honoured when his views were most unpopular. After the war he won the seat of Winston Churchill in Parliament. After describing the blood-feud which had been active for 250 years, in which Germany had been overrun, dismembered, and devastated by French armies, Lorraine seized in 1670 and later, Strasburg, and the ascendancy of France over all Germany for half a century, with fearful devastation of the Palatinate, he drew a picture of the Prussian and Austrian armies combined invading France to save the French monarchy from destruction:

"Four years later, French armies again poured over German soil and for *nine years* the German population underwent a repetition of the horrors inflicted on it by Louis XIV. In 1803, Napoleon created his confederation of the Rhine and all western Germany was dragooned into obedience

to his sway. In 1806, the French armies entered Berlin in triumph, the museums and art galleries were ransacked and the contents carried off to Paris. Four years later, as part of his campaign for the starvation of Britain and the destruction of her commerce, Napoleon annexed the northern coast of Germany. But the tide turned and the French imperial armies, that had ravaged almost every country in Europe, were pursued onto French soil at the hands of Prussian, Austrian, and British troops. That was the first of 'the three invasions within a century.' We took part in it.

"Another half century. The first step had been taken in the formation of a real German nation. All that was then necessary to make German unity complete was the adhesion of the southern states . . . but once more the emperor of the French stood in the way. She claimed the right to prevent the unification of Germany, but the Germans, after the French armies again started to invade Germany, drove them back to Paris. This was the 'second invasion.'"

As to the invasion in the World War, said Mr. Morel:

"No one enjoying either political or historical authority in this country has attempted to rebut the accumulated evidence (mainly Russian and French) which goes to prove that the Republican rulers of France, far from being guiltless for the

great war, played a very active part in bringing it about, deemed themselves fully prepared to undertake it and were confident of the result."

In fact, France and Russia together had vastly more men under arms than had Germany and Austria together when the war broke. As to what he calls the "population myth," Mr. Morel called attention to the fact that Germany's excess of population over that of France by 20,000,000 is vastly off-set, so far as danger is concerned, by the fact that France has applied military conscription to her millions of subjects in African possessions. Said Mr. Morel: "This conscription of Africa by France is one of those tremendous events which alter the destinies of nations. . . . It is far less a matter of obtaining 'security for France' than of obtaining security for Europe including the French people . . . against the recrudescence of a Napoleonic militarism with resources in men and raw materials which Napoleon never dreamed of." Though these words preceded by some years the Locarno compact, which seemed so happily to banish hostility and ensure security, they still have a measure of pertinence.

Norman Angell in his volume on "The Public Mind" maintains that a certain section of the press is pushed, as a first condition of its existence, to intensify the human weaknesses which underlie most

public folly, and to exploit immensely dangerous, disruptive forces. It largely controls the public mind and often renders the voice of the people, the voice of the devil. The hope of democracy lies in public recognition of this, as a navigator recognises where lie the reefs which he must avoid. Mr. Angell holds that right ethical and moral judgments about everyday things would seem to be vastly easier for the common mind to achieve than a knowledge of technical matters about bacteria and electrons. But, on the contrary, it is found far more difficult to achieve wisdom in ordinary matters about human relationships. Men who were keen to detect errors in scientific discussions were completely at the mercy of propagandists in war time, as they had never suspected the methods of deception used. They did not know what Lord Northcliffe wrote to Lloyd George in the *London Times* on November 16, 1917, that there were 500 officials of the British War Mission in the United States with 10,000 assistants; not that these were attempting to deceive, but certainly to give a wholly one-sided statement of affairs. Said *The World To-morrow*: *

“The French side of the story is even more extraordinary. Three years ago a French editor wrote an astonishing book about French journalism from the inside. Among others, he discloses

* April, 1927.

BEFORE AND AFTER THE WORLD WAR

the following: With the declaration of war the French government appropriated an initial 25,000,000 francs for propaganda. A large building of five stories, the Maison de la Presse, became headquarters. In the 200 rooms of this structure were huge presses, a photographic department, a translation department, etc. The business of the Maison was to arouse France and the world against Germany. It deliberately manufactured evidence to suit their needs. In the work of the photo-chemical department were the best artists of France. They produced in life-like miniature whatever was wanted."

Italy's ambitions have gone far toward dominating a large section of North Africa. Her conquest of Tripoli in 1910, and her gains from the World War, leave her disturbed by British control of Malta and French control of Tunis. She looks with keen suspicion on any further French control. France, with enormous expenses, debts that cannot be paid and plans for new forts, is feeling the heavy cost. But she has enormous issues at stake and wants uninterrupted hegemony from the coast to her own possessions in the hinterland. Great Britain, which wants unobstructed access secured by Gibraltar for her fleets to Suez, is bound to have a hand in the settlement of every dispute in the Mediterranean.

The elimination of French rule in bygone days in the wilds of Canada, and the immense Louisiana

territory, and the establishment of the English-speaking peoples there, cannot be compensated now by the acquisition of occupied territory in Africa which France has no surplus citizens to colonise. Moreover, French investors invest billions in other lands but not in Africa. France draws no colour line, and black men represent African possessions in the French Assembly. The great mass of 10,000,000 blacks in French West Africa have no vote, but there are black and white and yellow in its schools and in her civil service. In British West Africa the colour line is sharply drawn. The faithful blacks who fought for France in the World War would have had no interest to do so had they not felt that France treated them as no other conquerors have treated Africans. This fact is a vast insurance of the future of France in Africa. Nevertheless, while France has lately added by conquest enormous new areas, she has no colonists. Germany could send out many colonists but has lost her colonies. Great Britain has both colonists and colonies, though now they are all practically independent in a Commonwealth of Nations. As the population of France hardly holds its own, and three millions of foreigners are taking the place there of the men lost in the war, France can send forth no settlers. Two hundred years ago her population exceeded that of Great Britain and Germany combined. To-day,

the French colonies contain only 300,000 French in a population of over 42,000,000 French subjects in Africa. These colonies are an economic burden, not an asset, and cannot be made to pay. Said Dr. Charles Sarolea, Professor of French literature in Edinburgh University, an experienced African traveller and student, "The results bear no proportion whatsoever to the enormous expenditure, to the magnificent effort exerted, and to the tragic political sacrifices. The results do not justify the controlling influence of the colonies in French foreign policy. The third colonial empire seems destined eventually to follow the vicissitudes of the two others in America. It will have deflected the whole course of French foreign policy, and yet it will not be a permanent achievement."

Among the able opponents of the war, Professor Nicolai of Berlin, who wrote his "Biology of War" in prison, during the war, and Alfred Fried of Vienna, with Professors Quidde and Förster, deserve mention together with Leon Bourgeois of France, Romain Rolland, Jean Jaurès and others who tried in vain to stem the tide which swept their respective nations when the hysteria of fear had banished all sane thought. The governments were not unprepared, however surprised the mass of citizens might have been. Sir Julian Corbett in his "History of Naval Operations in the War" says:

"Given the scale which we deliberately chose to adopt, there is no doubt that the machinery for setting our forces in action had reached an ordered completeness in detail that had no parallel in history."

The fearful blockade of Germany, which lasted for months after the Armistice, was responsible for the deaths of scores of thousands of helpless innocents; children and old people died a lingering death of starvation, and of disease incident to malnutrition. For years after the war the scholarly class lived like unskilled workers. Professors turned the key upon their laboratories, sold their libraries, and did menial work to get bread for their children. Said one newspaper, the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*: "High officials have a bowl of soup at noon, a bit of bread and sausage, or potatoes, turnip, and carrots at night. High School principals have been forced to sell part of their meagre household outfit in order to live." Alfred Fried, himself a winner of a Nobel peace prize, wrote of the intellectual starvation which lasted for years and to some extent still continues: "Foreign newspapers bring fabulous prices. The manual labourer almost always has a higher income than the university professor. German scientific papers are at the point of death because the publishers can no longer support the risks. From Vienna came the word: 'Our great libraries soon will

BEFORE AND AFTER THE WORLD WAR

be utterly unable to purchase books, for the income from their endowment scarcely pays for the binding of presentation copies. . . . Austria will soon be completely shut off from the world by the barrier of its paper money The chemical institutes had no glass, no rubber, no retorts, no metal at the end of the war; we were five years behind in scientific literature We stand face to face with the extinction of branches of knowledge without which modern economic life and modern hygiene are inconceivable.' ”

What these scientists were losing was not merely loss to them but to the whole world. The mute inglorious Keplers, Roentgens, Einsteins, Pasteurs, Marconis, Wattses, whom the lack of timely “discussion,” doomed to insanity or bloody death, took benefit incalculable from unborn generations.

The United States, the people most remote from war and suffering, experienced a bitterness and indulged in a vindictiveness which was a revelation that amazed those who had not known what was latent in our character. Being a college graduate gave no assurance of logical thought, of possessing bowels of mercy, imagination and the power to understand an enemy's point of view, or any desire to do justice. One who dared think independently or to question the prevailing view of the “Hun” was at once dubbed “pro-German,” just as, later, he was

called "Bolshevist." It was three or four years after the war before a calmer mood supervened, after Philip Gibbs and others had revealed how the masses had been nerved to frenzy by purposeful misinformation, just as, later, newspaper men were sent to Geneva with instructions to report nothing good of the League of Nations. In 1920, John F. Moors, a Boston banker and philanthropist, correctly described the situation then. "Espionage, raids, deportations, hitherto held to be obnoxious to American traditions, are accepted as inevitable. The very word 'Russia,' is almost taboo. No one seems to have a right to ask whether there is or is not a blockade of that suffering country, or, if there is one, why there is. Even the time-honoured rights of *habeas corpus* are endangered. Suddenly one realises that the liberty which seemed forever ours without further struggle, is, if not gone, going . . ."

John A. Hobson, a careful student of the American attitude of mind at various periods, said some years later: "The American acceptance of liberty is grounded in an acceptance of standardisation . . . its condition is one of close conformity . . . imposed upon him by the power of mechanical large-scale production. He wants to be like his neighbours. In itself an amiable quality, it lapses into what so many critics have recognised as a chief danger of democracy, the herd mind and the tyranny

of the majority . . . During the war this herd passion and its intolerance blazed more fiercely in America, than in any of the European belligerents except perhaps in France."

One outstanding illustration was the case of four young Russians, three men and a girl, who were convicted under the Espionage Act for circulating handbills criticising the Government's policy toward Russia, couched in highly coloured language and calling for a strike of munition makers. Justice Brandeis and Justice Holmes of the Supreme Court dissented from the approval of their condemnation and said: "In this case sentences of twenty years' imprisonment have been imposed for the publishing of two leaflets that I believe the defendants had as much right to publish as the Government has to publish the Constitution of the United States now vainly invoked by them."

The tarring and feathering and sometimes killing of members of the Industrial Workers of the World, the wholesale deportation of 1,200 alleged members who were working in mines in Bisbee, Arizona, were only a few of the high-handed proceedings that disgraced the nation during the period which Louis F. Post, assistant Secretary of Labour, described in his volume "The Deportation Delirium of Nineteen-Twenty." He said: "So far did the spirit of the Department of Justice carry its detectives and their

coadjutors, that they directed their machinery of intimidation at every official who in the performance of his duty was trying to administer justly the law of the land in the 'red' deportations . . . One of the most gratifying and reassuring of all the events developed by the deportations delirium occurred. Twelve American lawyers of honourable distinction . . . with the eminent Dean of the Law School of Harvard University at their head, publicly indicted the Department of Justice on Constitutional grounds for its lawlessness in connection with the deportations crusade . . . The Senate ordered an investigation . . . the facts disclosed were by Constitutional tests damning. Our laws for the protection of our Government from aliens conspiring for its forcible overthrow had been so drawn as to necessitate deportations for harmless expressions of harmless opinions. . . . Had the public sentiment that made this crusade possible been a product of considerate American thought, instead of a temporary delirium, the democracy of our Republic would have barely escaped destruction by the very forces that were operating professedly for its preservation."

In regard to America's charity to stricken Europe after the war, it must be said there was never such an exhibition of liberal, helpful giving, as, of course, there has never been such need of it. The relief work in Belgium, France, Germany, Austria, Tur-

BEFORE AND AFTER THE WORLD WAR

key, and Russia after the war, under the Red Cross, the Friends' Society, the Near East and other agencies, especially, at first, the wonderful work of Herbert Hoover in saving the lives of millions, constitutes one of the most glorious chapters in the tragedies of human history. Lest we be exalted above measure however, it is chastening to remember that our total contributions for starving Europe were far less than our expenditures during the same period for tobacco and chewing gum.

The war increased everywhere the spirit of narrow nationalism which, except in states having large relations in Europe and in intellectual classes, had, before the war, left the great bulk of the people grossly uninformed and uninterested in foreign affairs. During our period of participation in the war there was intense interest accompanied with much emotion, and very limited information which, in many quarters, has been only slightly increased since the war. English lecturers who come here are amazed at the stolid indifference by great masses in large sections regarding everything but our own affairs; this is not surprising, considering the character of most of the newspapers they read, which are devoid of significant information and stress what is sensational, trivial, and local. Every citizen who can afford to buy a box of cigarettes or chocolates might do well to subscribe to one or more of the

valuable leaflets or bulletins, which for the same price can be had weekly or monthly to supply vital news * regarding the whole problem of war and peace. It seems not unjust to say that, with shining and notable exceptions, the American people as a whole have not learned the lesson of the World War and are unconsciously one of the chief obstacles to world organisation, and, therefore, to world peace. One stumbling-block is confused thinking as to the function in this world of armed force.

* See Appendix.

CHAPTER XIII

THE USE OF ARMED FORCE

At the Assembly of the League of Nations, in 1924, the delegates saw a great light; an enormous step forward was taken when they unanimously recommended to their respective governments that they accept the provisions of the Geneva Protocol, which had been there considered, and which began by asserting that "war of aggression constitutes a violation of the solidarity of the international community and is an international crime." For some of the most important ideas embodied in the Protocol the Assembly was indebted to Professor Shotwell of Columbia University and his eminent American colleagues.

Though the Protocol has not come into force, a profound impression was made on the thinking people of all countries, and its main provisions will doubtless eventually be accepted, if the world is to attain security and peace. Had the United States been in the League and accepted the position which the French government accepted then and later confirmed, namely, that it would be willing to adopt

peaceful methods of settling international disputes specified in the Protocol, it seems that Great Britain and her dominions would have ratified the Protocol. Said Charles Roden Buxton: "Not a single power among those concerned has gone back on it. It is not France nor any other power among those which is preventing the realisation of Arbitration and Disarmament." It is a matter of grave concern to all Americans who long to see our country a member of the League that when Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa, and the Irish Free State sent in their replies to Great Britain's query, each and all showed concern as to how the ratification might affect possible relations with the United States. South Africa declared, "to accept the Protocol, members feel, would be only to make it more difficult for countries outside the League, notably America, to become members and would consequently contribute very materially to making it impossible for the League to attain its real object." Canada, in advising against acceptance, declared: "Among the grounds for this conclusion is the consideration of the effect of the non-participation of the United States upon attempts to enforce the sanctions, and particularly so, in the case of a contiguous country like Canada." The Irish Free State said:

"As long as some of the more powerful states refrain from participation in the League of Nations,

the feeling of distrust and uneasiness must continue." The British government in refusing its adherence said the League of Nations "never supposed that among the states which might remain out of the League would be found so many of the most powerful nations, least of all did they foresee that one of them would be the United States of America."

Is not our country, therefore, having seriously handicapped fifty-five nations in their attempt to extend arbitration and disarmament and to gain a sense of security, under peculiar obligations to the world to bestir itself and remove itself from being an incubus to world progress?

Security is a relative term. There is no means of obtaining absolute security between individuals so long as bandits, fools, and children can buy pistols, and so long as lawmakers and courts are very fallible. There is no absolute guarantee of security between cities, though warfare between cities such as existed in mediæval days is unknown in our time. There is no absolute guarantee of peace between one of our states and another state. Let it be reiterated that there is no guarantee that civil war, rebellion, revolution, and riots may not break out in this and in other countries; in fact, we are certain that after international war has been outlawed and practically ended, strife may break out within the limits of a country. The last form of killing to be abolished

will be murder, which requires no collective action and organised preparation and may occasionally occur at any possible future time when submarines and tanks have become as obsolete as spears and thumbscrews.

There can never be any absolute security. Nothing in this world is sure but death and mathematics. To-day we are discussing relative security, practical security, such as every citizen feels he possesses in a city of police and courts; at least security from purposeful attack, however long, with our reckless city building and congestion and insufficient laws, we permit the slaughter by automobiles in one year of more citizens than fell in our first four foreign wars combined. If practical security from attack can be obtained in small areas, why not in ever larger and larger ones? There is no different principle involved in either. Does not world peace involve simply an expansion in application of those principles which have worked throughout forty-eight states of our Federal Republic and throughout the areas of the British Commonwealth of Nations, with 440,000,000 black, white, yellow, and brown people speaking hundreds of different languages and having many religions?

How is this comparative security from attack in smaller areas obtained? A certain town in Maine a few years since had 13,000 inhabitants but only

THE USE OF ARMED FORCE

two policemen. That town may have a few more now and need them, but the facts remain that security in that town and in other towns and cities, in nations, and in the world, depends ninety-five per cent on the good-will of the people, not on fear of the police. The people know that chaos would be let loose and they themselves be despoiled, if they were not obedient to law.

How far shall penalties be provided for those who break the peace and are a public menace? Physical punishment in nursery and public school has extraordinarily diminished everywhere within two generations. Organised sport, team play, school cheers which let off steam, with milder discipline, make it possible for a teacher to work off the animal spirits of 2,000 boys and secure an obedience that the old school master with rattan and ferule never got from twenty boys. The nations are as late in learning the lesson of national psychology as were parents in learning child psychology or lawmakers that of criminals. A minimum of corporal punishment for specially unruly youngsters is sometimes wholesome. Police compulsion for breakers of the law is and always will be a necessity. Sheriffs, state militia or constabulary, and a national guard will also remain a necessity so long as we can see into the future. Now how far shall army and navy be used to serve as a method of attaining security?

The Navy League which exists to bring pressure to bear on Congress as regards appropriations for "adequate defence," declares: "First and foremost the navy is our first line of defence. The navy exists as the physical sanction of our foreign policies just as federal, state, and domestic police are the sanction of our domestic laws. 'Our foreign policy is as strong as our navy and no stronger.' The country needs a navy second to none, that when nations are assembled around the Council board our statesmen will be heard as attentively as those of any other country." To promote this theory a series of bulletins presenting it have been sent by the League to 3,000 newspapers throughout the country. There is apparently no thought in the Navy League that when we make economic pressure and all-inclusive arbitration treaties part of our foreign policy, we shall have a sanction far more effective than explosives and those scientific devices for slaughter which the next decade will make obsolete. The Navy League ignores the historic fact that when we had a very small navy we were a world power and the moral leader of the nations and that, despite huge armaments, we have now lost a large share of moral leadership.

The League of Nations provides for economic pressure and for the exercise of collective military power when the Council shall so determine. Accord-

ing to the Protocol of 1924, not ratified: "Those obligations shall be interpreted as obliging each of the signatory states to co-operate loyally and effectively in support of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and in resistance to any aggression, in the degree which its geographical position and its particular situation as regards armaments allow." The Council can only recommend, it cannot *decide*, the contribution of each state. The states are bound to afford passage to the troops engaged in protecting the covenants of the League. The aggressor state is to be automatically known to be an aggressor if it "resorts to war in violation of the undertakings contained in the Covenant or in the Protocol. Violation of the rules laid down for a demilitarised zone shall be held equivalent."

In the famous Article X of the Covenant, which declares that "The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League," no mention is made as to the method to be employed. Thus far no mention of collective military force has been agreed to by the Council, though milder measures have been brought to bear as previously mentioned, when Jugo-Slavia was brought to terms when she encroached on Albania, and when Italian troops fired on Corfu after her officers had been assas-

sinated. This was an attack essentially like ours on Vera Cruz, except that Italy was bound by her pledges in the League, and we were acting according to traditional rights of a sovereign nation which has taken no pledges and desires to be free to go to war when it pleases. The Greco-Bulgarian episode was another illustration. All the great nations are almost as much armed as they were before the World War, with the exception of Germany; with the fear and suspicion that still obtains, they have no intention of disarming before they feel that arbitration is accepted as obligatory and security is reasonably assured; the question therefore arises as to the possibility of the exercise of force, if any nation refuses to arbitrate and invades another nation that consents to arbitrate. Certain peace advocates have called this use of collective force for police purposes "war." There are some who, while consenting to the restraint and physical punishment of individuals and even to the execution of individual assassins, maintain that one can never consider a nation of men and women and children as a unit to be punished for guilt. They hold that no power has the moral right to punish the innocent who are related to the guilty or happen to live in the country with them. The contention of these peace advocates is sound that one cannot indict a whole nation. But the question is, of two evils which is the worse.

Granted that no military compulsion could ever be exerted to enforce a policy of the League or a decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice, just as no military force can ever be exerted to enforce a decision of our Supreme Court; nevertheless, in case of invasion and the oppression of a nation that consents to arbitrate there is a quite different situation, which is very considerable and must be faced.

What is the ethics of the situation? The famous discussion in the Constitutional Convention about the coercion of a state is important to consider. Madison, after proposing to call forth the force of the Union against any member of the Union which failed to fulfil its duty under the articles of the Constitution, soon saw the folly of this and wrote, "A Union of the states containing such an ingredient seemed to provide for its own destruction. The use of force against a state would seem more like a declaration of war than an infliction of punishment, and would probably be considered by the party attacked as a dissolution of all previous contracts, by which it might be bound." It is true that in the comparatively recent case between Virginia and West Virginia, when there was delay in acceptance of the terms of the verdict by the Supreme Court, Chief Justice White said that he would find a way to bring about obedience. But this was not a decision

of the Court. In its earlier days the Supreme Court had been confronted by disobedience and its decisions occasionally flouted, as in the case of Georgia in the Chisholm case in 1792. The other twelve states sided with Georgia against the Court. There have been a number of instances where states have ignored or refused to accept decision by lower federal courts. But in no instance has military force backed up the decision of our Supreme Court, and it will never be called to enforce the decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Certain advocates of peace have rashly inferred that because no force can or ought to be used in sustaining the decisions of the highest courts as regards states, that any exercise of military force would be "war." In the Geneva Protocol the proposals for penalties for aggression, when the aggressor is recognised by the League as such, are essentially the same as those provided by the United States for keeping law and order when there is an outbreak in our republic. Again and again the United States forces have entered different states to maintain peace until violent disorder had ceased, and the original dispute could be either left unsettled or settled legally. They were carrying out essentially police functions. The policeman does not settle a dispute. He insists that disputants shall not stab each other when they have a dispute, but shall take it to court.

The collective force of the city or of the nation in restraining disorder and in compelling recourse to courts is the same type of force as that advocated by the framers of Article X of the Covenant and of the unratified Protocol. It may involve suffering of the innocent. But so does the arrest of a criminal father bring suffering to innocent wife and children. So may the appearance of federal troops in turbulent states. The question is, which is the greater of two evils?

Collective, repressive military force has none of the characteristics of predatory, revengeful war. It is not conducted by nations that have a personal grievance. Just as rioting ceases when federal troops appear, so it goes without saying no single power will ever stand out against a collective force that is vastly superior. There is no reason to suppose that military repressive measures will ever need to be employed against one aggressor when the defensive nation has agreed to arbitrate. Will it suffice to assume this at the start and abolish all repressive force beyond that of economic and diplomatic pressure? Evidently no nation goes so far. Arbitration, Security, Disarmament. This is the sequence insisted on by our nation and all others. Granted that complete, universal disarmament would bring security from attack. Granted that our own national disarmament would not endanger us and

would advance our moral leadership for it would imply that we are a very different people from what we know ourselves to be,—absolutely just and righteous and everywhere recognised as such. But the question is, what, under existing conditions of increasing armaments, continued fear and suspicion, the nations can be persuaded to carry as a minimum of force. The requirement to use force as a last resort to drive home an aggressor is perhaps the chief reason for American hesitancy to enter the League. It is the serious objection which Great Britain finds to the Protocol. The proposal of Professor Shotwell is one that deserves profound consideration. It is that the use of force by the neutral nations shall not be obligatory, as the Protocol would make it, but *optional*. An aggressor nation would first suffer milder coercion—economic pressure, possibly blockade; though that should never go so far as to starve a people and never when, as in the allied blockade after the Armistice it was exercised on a nation that had laid down arms, or at least had ceased fighting. The sole object of force should be to compel the force of the aggressor to cease and should go no further.

If the aggressor is outlawed and as such deprived of any security for his property in other lands; if he retains no rights that any one is bound to observe; if he may have several antagonists instead of one enemy to contend with and any nation may cut off

trade, commercial and financial intercourse, such an aggressor is bound quickly to come to terms. If in the remotely conceivable circumstance that several nations likewise become aggressors and come to the help of this aggressor, we should then see on a larger scale such a condition as existed here during our Civil War. It would mean another World War. But the probability of another World War, unless the nations accept responsibility for suppressing aggression and pledge themselves to peaceful settlement of their disputes is incalculably greater. The confounding of the police type of force with that of rival armies and navies tends to prevent the assurance of a minimum of protective force in the background. This assurance would lead to decrease of armaments and a sense of security. Without this sense of security, disarmament cannot be expected; and any fantastic or merely theoretical objections to it are out of harmony with the universally accepted collective repression of violence within each nation, and are a hindrance to world peace.

The primary consideration is an international agreement on certain standards of international conduct and the education of the world to sacrifice everything for the maintenance of those standards. The world is now practically agreed to condemn and repress any nation that attacks another which stands ready to arbitrate.

APPENDIX

SOME PEACE ORGANISATIONS

(Several supply pamphlets free or at nominal price.)

1. AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY (the oldest in the world).
Advocate of Peace. 612 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
2. AMERICAN SCHOOL CITIZENSHIP LEAGUE, 405 Marlboro Street, Boston, Mass.
3. CARNEGIE PEACE ENDOWMENT. Supplies a vast amount of free literature to libraries. 407 West 117th Street, New York City.
4. CHURCH PEACE UNION, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
5. CHRISTIANITY AND WORLD PROBLEMS SERIES. Pamphlets by Kirby Page, Sherwood Eddy and others; 10 or 15 cents; nearly a million sold. 347 Madison Avenue, New York City.
6. CONFERENCE ON CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR. Annually convenes delegates from nine national women's organizations. 171 Madison Avenue, New York City.
7. FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION. *News Bulletin* (weekly), \$1.00 a year. 18 East 41st Street, New York City.
8. LEAGUE OF NATION'S NON-PARTISAN ASSOCIATION. *League of Nation News* (monthly). 6 East 39th Street, New York City.

LAW OR WAR

9. NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF WAR.
News Bulletin (monthly), 25 cents a year. 532
17th Street, Washington, D. C.
10. WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. Issues valuable technical
pamphlets, 5 cents each. 40 Mt. Vernon Street,
Boston, Mass.
11. WORLD ALLIANCE TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL
FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES. Holds
great national and international conferences. 70
Fifth Avenue, New York City.

COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

WITH AMENDMENTS IN FORCE APRIL 1, 1928

Italics Indicate Revision

THE HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES,

In order to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security

by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war,

by the prescription of open, just and honorable relations between nations,

by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and

by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another, Agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 1

Membership and Withdrawal

1. The original Members of the League of Nations shall be those of the Signatories which are named in the Annex to this Covenant, and also such of those other States named in the Annex as shall accede without reservation to this Covenant. Such accessions shall be effected by a declaration deposited with the Secretariat within two months of the coming into force of the Covenant. Notice thereof shall be sent to all other Members of the League.

LAW OR WAR

2. Any fully self-governing State, Dominion or Colony not named in the Annex may become a Member of the League if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the Assembly, provided that it shall give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its military, naval and air forces and armaments.

3. Any Member of the League may, after two years' notice of its intention so to do, withdraw from the League, provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under this Covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal.

ARTICLE 2

Executive Organs

The action of the League under this Covenant shall be effected through the instrumentality of an Assembly and of a Council, with a permanent Secretariat.

ARTICLE 3

Assembly

1. The Assembly shall consist of representatives of the Members of the League.

2. The Assembly shall meet at stated intervals and from time to time, as occasion may require, at the Seat of the League, or at such other place as may be decided upon.

3. The Assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

4. At meetings of the Assembly each Member of the League shall have one vote and may have not more than three Representatives.

APPENDIX

ARTICLE 4

Council

1. The Council shall consist of representatives of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers [United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan], together with Representatives of four¹ other Members of the League. These four¹ Members of the League shall be selected by the Assembly from time to time in its discretion. Until the appointment of the Representatives of the four Members of the League first selected by the Assembly, Representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Greece and Spain shall be Members of the Council.

2. With the approval of the majority of the Assembly, the Council may name additional Members of the League, whose Representatives shall always be Members of the Council;² the Council with like approval may increase the number of Members of the League to be selected by the Assembly² for representation on the Council.¹

2 bis. The Assembly shall fix by a two-thirds majority the rules dealing with the election of the non-permanent Members of the Council, and particularly such regulations as relate to their term of office and the conditions of re-eligibility.

3. The Council shall meet from time to time as occasion may require, and at least once a year, at the Seat of the League, or at such other place as may be decided upon.

4. The Council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

¹ *The number of Members of the Council selected by the Assembly, by application of the second clause of Art. 4, par. 2, was increased from four to six on September 25, 1922, and from six to nine on September 8, 1926.*

² *By application of this clause Germany was designated as a permanent Member of the Council on September 8, 1926, the appropriate action of the Council having been taken on September 4,*

LAW OR WAR

5. Any Member of the League not represented on the Council shall be invited to send a Representative to sit as a member at any meeting of the Council during the consideration of matters specially affecting the interests of that Member of the League.

6. At meetings of the Council, each Member of the League represented on the Council shall have one vote, and may have not more than one Representative.

ARTICLE 5

Voting and Procedure

1. Except where otherwise expressly provided in this Covenant, or by the terms of the present Treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting.

2. All matters of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council, including the appointment of Committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly or by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the Members of the League represented at the meeting.

3. The first meeting of the Assembly and the first meeting of the Council shall be summoned by the President of the United States of America.

ARTICLE 6

Secretariat and Expenses

1. The permanent Secretariat shall be established at the Seat of the League. The Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary-General and such secretaries and staff as may be required.

2. The first Secretary-General shall be the person named

APPENDIX

in the Annex; thereafter the Secretary-General shall be appointed by the Council with the approval of the majority of the Assembly.

3. The secretaries and the staff of the Secretariat shall be appointed by the Secretary-General with the approval of the Council.

4. The Secretary-General shall act in that capacity at all meetings of the Assembly and of the Council.

5. *The expenses of the League shall be borne by the Members of the League in the proportion decided by the Assembly.*

ARTICLE 7

Seat, Qualifications of Officials, Immunities

1. The Seat of the League is established at Geneva.

2. The Council may at any time decide that the Seat of the League shall be established elsewhere.

3. All positions under or in connection with the League, including the Secretariat, shall be open equally to men and women.

4. Representatives of the Members of the League and officials of the League when engaged on the business of the League shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

5. The buildings and other property occupied by the League or its officials or by Representatives attending its meetings shall be inviolable.

ARTICLE 8

Reduction of Armaments

1. The Members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

LAW OR WAR

2. The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments.

3. Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every 10 years.

4. After these plans shall have been adopted by the several Governments, the limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the Council.

5. The Members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those Members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

6. The Members of the League undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval and air programs, and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to war-like purposes.

ARTICLE 9

Permanent Military, Naval and Air Commission

A permanent Commission shall be constituted to advise the Council on the execution of the provisions of Articles 1 and 8 and on military, naval and air questions generally.

ARTICLE 10

Guarantees Against Aggression

The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial in-

APPENDIX

tegrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

ARTICLE 11

Action in Case of War or Threat of War

1. Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise, the Secretary-General shall, on the request of any Member of the League, forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

2. It is also declared to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

ARTICLE 12

Disputes to Be Submitted for Settlement

1. The Members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture they will submit the matter either to arbitration or *judicial settlement* or to inquiry by the Council and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the *judicial decision*, or the report by the Council.

2. In any case under this Article, the award of the ar-

LAW OR WAR

bitrators or the judicial decision shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

ARTICLE 13

Arbitration or Judicial Settlement

1. The Members of the League agree that, whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement, and which can not be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration or judicial settlement.

2. Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement.

3. For the consideration of any such dispute, the court to which the case is referred shall be the Permanent Court of International Justice, established in accordance with Article 14, or any tribunal agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

4. The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award or decision that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a Member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award or decision, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.

APPENDIX

ARTICLE 14

Permanent Court of International Justice

The Council shall formulate and submit to the Members of the League for adoption plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. The Court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The Court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly.

ARTICLE 15

Disputes Not Submitted to Arbitration or Judicial Settlement

1. If there should arise between Members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration or *judicial settlement* in accordance with Article 13, the Members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary-General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof.

2. For this purpose the parties to the dispute will communicate to the Secretary-General, as promptly as possible, statements of their case, with all the relevant facts and papers, and the Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

3. The Council shall endeavor to effect a settlement of the dispute and, if such efforts are successful, a statement shall be made public giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereof as the Council may deem appropriate.

LAW OR WAR

4. If the dispute is not thus settled, the Council, either unanimously or by a majority vote, shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto.

5. Any Member of the League represented on the Council may make public a statement of the facts of the dispute and of its conclusions regarding the same.

6. If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the Members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

7. If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

8. If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the Council, to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

9. The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within 14 days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

10. In any case referred to the Assembly, all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the Representatives of

APPENDIX

those Members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other Members of the League, exclusive in each case of the Representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

ARTICLE 16

Sanctions of Pacific Settlement

1. ¹ Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not.

2. It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what

¹ "It is for the Council to give an opinion whether or not a breach of the Covenant has taken place. In deliberations on this question in the Council, the votes of Members of the League alleged to have resorted to war and of Members against whom such action was directed shall not be counted.

"The Council will notify to all Members of the League the date which it recommends for the application of the economic pressure under this Article.

"Nevertheless, the Council may, in the case of particular Members, postpone the coming into force of any of these measures for a specified period where it is satisfied that such a postponement will facilitate the attainment of the object of the measures referred to in the preceding paragraph, or that it is necessary in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience which will be caused to such Members."

LAW OR WAR

effective military, naval or air force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

3. The Members of the League agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article, in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the Members of the League which are cooperating to protect the covenants of the League.

4. Any Member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a Member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred in by the Representatives of all the other Members of the League represented thereon.

ARTICLE 17

Disputes Involving Nonmembers

1. In the event of a dispute between a Member of the League and a State which is not a Member of the League, or between States not Members of the League, the State or States not Members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of Membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles 12 to 16, inclusive, shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council.

2. Upon such invitation being given, the Council shall

APPENDIX

immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances.

3. If a State so invited shall refuse to accept the obligations of Membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, and shall resort to war against a Member of the League, the provisions of Article 16 shall be applicable as against the State taking such action.

4. If both parties to the dispute, when so invited, refuse to accept the obligations of Membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, the Council may take such measures and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

ARTICLE 18

Registration and Publication of Treaties

Every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any Member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

ARTICLE 19

Review of Treaties

The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by Members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable, and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world.

LAW OR WAR

ARTICLE 20

Abrogation of Inconsistent Obligations

1. The Members of the League severally agree that this Covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof.

2. In case any Member of the League shall, before becoming a Member of the League, have undertaken any obligation inconsistent with the terms of this Covenant, it shall be the duty of such Member to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations.

ARTICLE 21

Engagements that Remain Valid

Nothing in this Covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

ARTICLE 22

Mandatory System

1. To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant.

APPENDIX

2. The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who, by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position, can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as Mandatories on behalf of the League.

3. The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of the development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic conditions and other similar circumstances.

4. Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory.

5. Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the Mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience and religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defense of territory, and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League.

6. There are territories, such as Southwest Africa and certain of the South Pacific islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population or their small size, or their remoteness from the centers of civilization, or their geo-

graphical contiguity to the territory of the Mandatory, and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the Mandatory as integral portions of its territory, subject to the safeguards above mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population.

7. In every case of mandate, the Mandatory shall render to the Council an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

8. The degree of authority, control or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory shall, if not previously agreed upon by the Members of the League, be explicitly defined in each case by the Council.

9. A permanent Commission shall be constituted to receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatories, and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the mandates.

ARTICLE 23

Social and Other Activities

Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the Members of the League:

- (a) will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organizations;
- (b) undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control;
- (c) will intrust the League with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the

APPENDIX

- traffic in women and children and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs;
- (d) will intrust the League with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest;
 - (e) will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all Members of the League. In this connection, the special necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914-1918 shall be borne in mind;
 - (f) will endeavor to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease.

ARTICLE 24

International Bureaus

1. There shall be placed under the direction of the League all international bureaus already established by general treaties, if the parties to such treaties consent. All such international bureaus and all commissions for the regulation of matters of international interest hereafter constituted shall be placed under the direction of the League.

2. In all matters of international interest which are regulated by general conventions but which are not placed under the control of international bureaus or commissions, the Secretariat of the League shall, subject to the consent of the Council and if desired by the parties, collect and distribute all relevant information and shall render any other assistance which may be necessary or desirable.

3. The Council may include as part of the expenses of the Secretariat the expenses of any bureau or commission which is placed under the direction of the League.

LAW OR WAR

ARTICLE 25

Promotion of Red Cross and Health

The Members of the League agree to encourage and promote the establishment and cooperation of duly authorized voluntary national Red Cross organizations having as purposes the improvement of health, the prevention of disease and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world.

ARTICLE 26

Amendments

1. Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Assembly.

2. No such amendment shall bind any Member of the League which signifies its dissent therefrom, but in that case it shall cease to be a Member of the League.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CALIFORNIA

JX
1952
M34

Mead, Mrs. Lucia True (Ames) 1856-1936.

Law or war, by Lucia Ames Mead ... Garden City
Doubleday, Doran & company, inc., 1928.

ix p., 1 l., 276 p. 20cm.

"Some peace organizations": p. 257-258.

1. Peace. 2. War. 3. Arbitration, International.

1. Title.

Library of Congress

JX1952.M34

CCSC/e

A 5 302

